VOL. XX, No. 7 JULY, 1941

Copy C

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Support the U.S.S.R. in Its Fight Against the Nazi War	*Statement of the Communist Party, U.S.A.*	579
Yankee Imperialism Grabs for the Western Hemisphere	*William Z. Foster*	581
Browder's Contribution Toward Developing a Progressive Trade Unionism	*Jack Johnstone*	599
Professor Logan Is Ready for a Third World War!	*Henry Winston*	611
Colombia Faces the Imperialist Offensive	*Augusto Doran*	619
The Further Development of Capitalism in United States Agriculture	*Erik Bert*	623
The Treason of Reaction in America's Second War of Independence	*Frank Meyer and Robert Strong*	635
Space and Time—Forms of the Existence of Matter	*George Kursanov*	652

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street), New York. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW PAMPHLETS ON THE AMERICAN SCENE

Wages and Profits in Wartime, by Labor Research Association	$.05
Trade Unions and Negro Workers, by George Morris	.03
Communism and Culture, by Earl Browder	.05
Trends in the Labor Movement, by Roy Hudson	.03
The Railroad Workers and the War, by William Z. Foster	.03
The Communist Party of the U.S.A.: Its History, Role and Organization, by Earl Browder	.05
Earl Browder Says	.02
Old Jim Crow Has Got To Go, by Henry Winston	.01
The Negro in the Abolitionist Movement, by Herbert Aptheker	.15
Free Earl Browder!, by Robert Minor	.01
The Path of Browder and Foster	.03
Socialism: The Road to Peace, Prosperity and Freedom, by William Z. Foster	.05
Bright and Morning Star, by Richard Wright	.15
The Hollow Men, by Michael Gold	.25
The Constitution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.	.05

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUPPORT THE U.S.S.R. IN ITS FIGHT AGAINST NAZI WAR!

(Statement of the Communist Party, U.S.A., June 22, 1941.)

THE armed assault by German fascism and its satellites against the Soviet Union is an unprovoked criminal attack upon the greatest champion of peace, freedom and national independence—the land of socialism. This military aggression by the fascist rulers of Germany is also an attack upon the people of Germany. It is an attack likewise upon the peoples of the United States and of the entire world.

With the fullest support of all its people, the Soviet Government is now waging a struggle not only in defense of its socialist land but also in defense of the most vital interests of the peoples in all countries. It is waging a just struggle for the cause of the freedom of all nations and peoples.

Since its inception the Soviet Union has consistently and courageously fought for peace among the nations, for preventing war and checking aggression. When the Munich conspirators secured the upper hand in the ruling circles of the capitalist countries they destroyed existing possibilities for collective security, thereby making the second imperialist world war inevitable. The Soviet Union adopted and pursued a consistent policy of neutrality toward both sides in the imperialist war, a policy based upon rendering aid to those nations that were waging a just struggle for national independence and liberty. It aids the Chinese people as it aided the Spanish Republic. It liberated the peoples of the Western Ukraine, White Russia, Bessarabia, and the Baltic states. It fought against the extension and prolongation of the war. Thus it served the best interests of the working class and peoples of the entire world.

The reactionaries and imperialists of both sides have opposed and conspired against the peace and neutrality of the Soviet Union. They sought to drag the Soviet Union into the imperialist war.

Now the rulers of fascist Germany, in their desperate struggle with their imperialist rivals in England and the United States, and in mortal fear of the oppressed masses in Germany and in all the countries ravaged and enslaved by Germany, have seen fit to lay their criminal hands upon the Soviet Union.

Hitler is calling upon his friends

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and supporters in all the capitalist countries to join hands in war against the Soviet Union, in war against the working people and oppressed masses throughout the world. The rulers of fascist Germany are dangling before the imperialists of all countries, especially in England and the United States, the vision of a new Munich, a new conspiracy to redivide the world at the expense of the peoples of all nations, to crush the Soviet Union, to exterminate democracy in Europe and to strengthen reaction throughout the world. This was the message Hess brought to England. The friends of fascism in the United States and England are reaching out for this reactionary vision. The Scripps-Howard press, just before the attack of Hitler began, cynically declared, "That's one war we could really favor. . . ." This is likewise the position of the Social-Democratic lickspittles of big capital, who have long been demanding war against the Soviet Union.

The American people—the workers, toiling farmers, the Negro masses, the middle classes—all those who hate fascism and oppression and cherish peace and liberty, will see in the cause of the Soviet Union and its peoples the cause of all advanced and progressive mankind. They should defeat every attempt at a new Munich conspiracy. They should strive for active friendship and fraternal solidarity with the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Down with the criminal war of German fascism against the Soviet Union!

For full support and cooperation with the Soviet Union in its struggle against Hitlerism!

Against all those reactionaries of every stripe who seek in any manner to aid Hitler's attack against the Soviet Union!

For a people's peace based upon the liberation and independence of all nations!

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, *Chairman*
ROBERT MINOR, *Acting Secretary*
Communist Party, U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

YANKEE IMPERIALISM GRABS FOR THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The United States and the World War

THE present war constitutes a violent redivision of the world among the great imperialist powers. The main motive power behind the savage struggle for markets, raw materials, colonies and strategic positions is the ever-deepening general crisis of the obsolete and rotting world capitalist system. Assertions that either group of the warring powers is fighting for democracy and civilization are an insult to the people's intelligence.

In the war's saturnalia of rapine, destruction and conquest the several capitalist great powers are tearing one another's empires to pieces, enslaving semi-colonial lands, subjugating hitherto independent small capitalist countries, and maneuvering to attack the greatest prize of all, the U.S.S.R. Old empires have been shattered and new, jerry-built ones are being constructed almost overnight. Japan has seized vast areas of China and prepares to grab Indo-China, the Dutch East Indies, the Philippines and other choice morsels. Italy overran Ethiopia, only to have it snatched away again by Great Britain. Germany is building a monstrous system of imperialist control over all Europe up to the Soviet borders and is fighting for world hegemony. The French, Dutch and Belgian empires have been decapitated and their rich colonies exposed to imperialist sharks on the rampage. The British empire is fighting for its life, with its back to the wall.

United States imperialism is up to its eyes in this bloody and ruthless struggle for empire. It is already in the war economically, financially and diplomatically, and its Wall Street government is now watching for a favorable opportunity to violate the will to peace of the American people by plunging the country into the war fully as an active belligerent. The strongest imperialist power, naturally the United States is setting itself no modest goals in the war. It, too, is fighting for world hegemony. This Henry Luce, Senator Pepper and other outspoken imperialists are making increasingly clear, and President Roosevelt has told us of the "four freedoms" that the United States is out to enforce upon the world. At the moment United States imperialism, in its fight for world empire, finds it profitable to go along in alliance with Great Britain, but it will undoubtedly make any other arrangements it may deem necessary to further its imperialist interests.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greedy-eyed, American imperialists are now mulling over the most grandiose plans of world conquest. Singapore, Dakar, the Azores, Australia, China, the Dutch East Indies and Greenland are some of the far-flung places which the Yankee imperialists hope eventually to bring under United States control. But the basis of all their imperialistic dreamings and schemings is the conquest of the Western Hemisphere. From Hudson's Bay to Cape Horn, United States imperialism must rule unchallenged, declare these people. The three Americas are to be the special "lebensraum" of the United States, from which all other imperialist powers must keep their hands. To rule the Western Hemisphere as its very own is considered the God-given destiny of the United States. Within the camp of the American bourgeoisie there exist considerable differences as to the wisdom of the war alliance with Great Britain, but regarding the conquest of the Western Hemisphere they stand almost unanimous. On this question the "isolationists" Hoover, Lindbergh, La-Follette, Wheeler and Norman Thomas are tucked snugly in the same political bed with the "interventionists" Roosevelt, Willkie, Hull, Knox, Pepper, Wallace, Green and Hillman.

Yankee imperialism, in its plans for the conquest of the Western Hemisphere, has a twofold task—to drive out its chief imperialist rivals, England and Germany, and to force the submission of the many American peoples to its imperial will. Upon both aspects it is now diligently working. Resistance it is meeting, both from its imperialist rivals and from the peoples it aims to enslave; but on the whole its imperialist offensive is registering distinct progress. Every country in the Western Hemisphere confronts a serious danger—to its national independence and to the general welfare of its people—from the present militant advance of United States imperialism.

The Strategy of Hemisphere Conquest

In its drive to transform the whole Western Hemisphere into its main base, Yankee imperialism is not at the moment, within the Hemisphere countries proper, using the ruthless methods of military invasion employed by rampant Japanese imperialism in East Asia and by German imperialism in Europe and Africa. Its offensive is being carried on by a system of "peaceful" economic penetration and external political pressure, masked by an elaborate propaganda of friendly intentions. But behind all this looms the deadly threat of the gigantic and swiftly growing military, naval and air forces of the Colossus of the North.

Each of the many countries of the two continents which Wall Street claims as its very own presents an individual problem for the Yankee imperialists. Especially Canada. That country, with a population of over 11,000,000, is a formally independent state, highly industrialized, an imperialist state in its own right (having outstanding foreign investments of over two billion dollars), and it is a pillar of the British Empire. Its national independence, however, is considerably limited, because the bulk of its vital in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustries are owned by American and British capitalists, its foreign policy is largely formulated by the British Cabinet, and it lacks a navy and other armed forces capable of defending the country. The aim of Wall Street is to shift the control of this important land into the hands of the Washington government, in the guise of a sort of junior (very junior) partner in the "New Order" that United States imperialism hopes to set up in the Western Hemisphere. At the moment, the Yankee imperialists have an interest in keeping Canada within the British Empire, since this helps to hold it in the war and also enables American capital invested in Canada to get behind the Empire's tariff barriers and to enjoy its protected trade. In the likely event, however, of the serious weakening or break-up of the British Empire during this war, undoubtedly the United States would take definite steps to bring Canada under its "protecting" wing.

The Latin American countries also present many special problems. In general, however, the policy of Yankee imperialism is to reduce them to the status of near-colonial dependencies of the United States, with special concentration upon securing a firmer grip upon the countries north of the South American "bulge," particularly in the Caribbean area. This conquest is being pushed by means of economic, political, ideological and military penetration.

Hardly had the present world war begun than the United States, seeing that its chief imperialist rivals were busy elsewhere, greatly intensified its efforts to dominate all of Latin America. At the Panama (October, 1939) and Havana (July, 1941) conferences of the twenty-one American Republics (Canada excepted) the broad outlines were laid for this program of imperialist conquest. Briefly stated, the plan consists of lining up all the Latin American countries in a bloc under United States leadership, on the basis of policies of neutrality and peace, hemisphere defense, the adjustment of inter-state quarrels, the suppression of "subversive" activities, and a cooperative handling of the serious economic problems that are harassing all the three Americas. The whole program, stripped of the sugary phrases of Roosevelt, Hull and Wallace and boiled down to reality, amounts to flinging the doors wide open for Yankee imperialism to realize its objectives of subjugating the Latin American countries by colonializing their economies, dictating their internal political life, restricting their national independence, exploiting their peoples and natural resources, and using these countries en bloc as a great base to further its unfolding warlike plans of world imperialist conquest.

The Drive for Military Domination

The main means for the proposed Yankee conquest of the Western Hemisphere is the gigantic armed force that the United States is now swiftly building. This already dwarfs that of any other country of the three Americas. The *New York Post* (May 26) in the spirit of blatant American imperialism, boasts that within one year the United

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States is "going to be able to lick the world." That this great military establishment will be used, among its other predatory purposes, to dominate the weaker American countries only the most naive can disbelieve.

Among the products of the 40 billion dollars which the Roosevelt Administration is now recklessly spending for armaments, is, first, the contemplated 4,000,000-man mechanized army, which is specifically authorized by law to operate in Latin America. Then there is the great two-ocean navy, which already patrols and dominates all Western Hemisphere waters, and which is scheduled to be the most powerful navy in world history. Finally, there is the air force, now swiftly growing and planned eventually to number a minimum of 50,000 of the most modern and powerful airplanes. And all this vast armament is backed up by the great industries and huge manpower of the United States.

With this strong and growing armed force the Roosevelt Government is proceeding rapidly to surround the entire Western Hemisphere with a network of air and naval bases. At the same time the concept of what constitutes the Western Hemisphere is stretched to Asia from one side and Europe and Africa on the other. The already established United States bases in Hawaii, Alaska, Cuba, the Aleutian Islands, Guam, Wake and Samoa, as well as those along the United States coasts have been enormously strengthened. Bases are also undoubtedly contemplated for Greenland, the Azores, Dakar and the Cape Verde Islands. In exchange for 50 "obsolete" naval destroyers, England was made to concede the United States bases in its Western Hemisphere possessions, including Newfoundland, Bermuda, Jamaica, Trinidad, Antigua, Saint Lucia and British Guiana. The United States Government now is also busily bringing pressure to bear upon various Latin American countries for the establishment of a tight ring of strategically situated air and naval bases to surround all of Central and South America.

At the present moment, under the provisions of the so-called Act of Havana, which prohibits the transfer of American colonies from one European belligerent power to another, after taking over Greenland, the United States is now contemplating the seizure of the French colonies of Martinique, Guadaloupe, St. Pierre and Miquelon, French Guiana and Clipperton Island. Furthermore, the United States is making "mutual defense" pacts with neighboring American countries (examples, Canada and Mexico) which weaken the military position of these countries as against that of the United States. The Pan-American Highway, the new road through Canada to Alaska, and the securing of many American-controlled airlines in Latin America all go in the same general direction of Yankee military mastery.

This vast web of United States armed bases and military works, designed at once to keep away rivals of Yankee imperialism and to dominate Canada and the 20 Latin American republics, is being established in the name of a joint hemisphere defense. Special stress is laid upon the "joint" character of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"defense" by the Yankee imperialists to hide their predatory purposes. Thus, the "defense pacts" with Canada and Mexico are formally two-sided, but with the United States possessing the overwhelmingly greater military might it is not hard to guess where the deciding influence will lie. Thus, also, the colonies taken over from belligerents (Martinique, for example) are supposed to be administered by representatives of all the 21 American republics; but, as things now stand, in such situations, the United States vote (with its puppet supporters) would outweigh the rest. Then, too, the air and naval bases in the Latin American countries are to be nominally the property and in the control of the respective countries upon whose soil they are situated, and they are to be used jointly by all the American republics. But with the United States furnishing the money to build them and having the main air and naval forces to man them, who can doubt that decisive control would be exercised by the United States? The Chilean Defense Minister, Juvenal Hernandez, was right in stating that "The ceding of bases does not imply cooperation but submission." The present great drive of the United States to surround the whole Western Hemisphere with an iron ring of its armed forces is a menacing threat to the national independence of every other country in the two continents.

The Economic Offensive

Yankee imperialism's drive to dominate the Western Hemisphere militarily is supported by a strong offensive to dominate it economically. The general objectives of this economic offensive are: (a) to drive out British and German imperialism from Latin American markets and economic life, and (b) to colonialize the economies of the Latin American countries, so that these lands should become suppliers of raw materials and buyers of finished products from the industries of the United States. Toward Canada the policy is more one of absorption into the United States industrial system.

The war has greatly facilitated the weakening economically of its imperialist rivals in Latin America by Yankee imperialism. Germany has been largely cut off and England, up to its neck in war in Europe and Africa, cannot pay the closest attention to its Latin American interests. Also the Latin American countries, weakened by the loss of European markets and with their economies badly disordered, are less able to resist the economic pressure of the United States. So Yankee imperialism has a relatively clear field and is making the most of it.

The United States Government has set up a network of institutions and activities with which to push its economic conquest over the 125,000,000 Latin Americans. One important instrument is the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, formed after the Panama Conference of October, 1939, composed of 21 economic experts from all the American republics, and with headquarters in Washington. The functions of this committee are to deal with the eco-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomic problems of all the Americas—banking, currency, international exchange, commercial relations, treaties, imports and exports, customs and the development of new enterprises, credits and investments. The committee is completely dominated by agents of Yankee imperialism. It has a permanent working commission, known as the Inter-American Development Commission, significantly headed by Nelson A. Rockefeller. This whole apparatus functions financially through the Inter-American Bank, which is dominated by United States Government agents and puppets.

To provide the blood stream for its various schemes of economic conquest, the United States Government has resumed and is steadily increasing the export of capital to Latin America, which had virtually dried up during the 1930's because of the chaotic economic conditions then prevailing. Credits recently authorized up to December 31, 1940, to Latin American countries by the Export-Import Bank, according to the Bulletin of the National Foreign Trade Council (Feb. 1941), totaled $255,607,000, as follows:

Argentina	$62,670,000
Brazil	112,127,000
Chile	19,425,000
Colombia	10,004,500
Costa Rica	5,600,000
Cuba	4,000,000
Dominican Republic	3,000,000
Ecuador	1,150,000
Haiti	5,500,000
Mexico	500,000
Nicaragua	2,500,000
Panama	4,500,000
Paraguay	3,500,000
Peru	10,000,000
Uruguay	7,500,000
Venezuela	3,600,000

In accordance with the principles of colonial policy long since developed by Great Britain, these loans were primarily directed to the purposes of furthering United States trade and the creation of raw material sources necessary for American industries and non-competitive with them. Thus the loans provide that the agricultural products, railway equipment, construction materials, etc., should all be purchased in the United States and transported in its ships. The colonial character of the United States loans to Latin America was further made clear by the plan of inter-American development, presented to the Economic Advisory Committee by Carlos Davila, former President of Chile and a "warm friend" of the United States State Department. It is also explicitly stated by Mr. Henry A. Wallace, Vice President, in his book, *The American Choice*. Mr. Wallace would have Latin America produce "commodities which we need and are accustomed to import" and also tropical agricultural products not grown in the United States. Such a scheme, to make Latin American economy "complementary" to United States economy and non-competitive with it, would deny the Latin American countries the necessary rounded-out industrialization. It would render them economically and politically subordinate to and dependent upon the United States. This would still further emphasize their present semi-colonial character.

While advancing such colonial schemes, the United States is also conducting a militant trade drive generally to capture the markets of Latin America. A sample of the methods used, reported exultantly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Nelson A. Rockefeller to a group of New York business men (The *N. Y. Times,* May 12), is to cut off trade relations between United States business concerns and Latin American companies that do business with Axis firms. Said Mr. Rockefeller, "We have communicated with 17,000 companies interested in export trade and have requested them to use care in taking on new representatives and accounts."

One of the newest schemes to corral the trade of Latin America for Yankee imperialists (*N. Y. Times,* May 29) is to establish a joint export control over "war materials" by the United States and the 20 Latin American republics. Considering the predominant strength of the United States, the effects of this agreement, if consummated, would be (a), to give this country a more solid grip upon Latin American export and import trade, and (b), to force more definitely the Latin American peoples into the world war program of Yankee imperialism.

By the same token, the so-called American Customs Union, adopted by the American Conference of Associations of Commerce and Production at Montevideo, Jan. 3, 1941, would enormously favor United States trade as against that of its imperialist rivals and of the relatively weaker Latin American countries.

Fortune, organ of big business, in its May number, boldly expresses the predatory purposes behind the present American economic offensive in Latin America, stating, "The South American market must be closed; it must become an exclusive U. S. trade area."

Toward Canada the Yankee imperialists have, as already stated, a policy of absorption. Canada is already a highly industrialized country. American investments there, totaling almost $4,000,000,000, are almost equal to the United States investments throughout all Latin America. Exports to Canada from the United States in 1939 (now enormously increased by the war boom) were five times as great as United States exports to Brazil, which has 4½ times as large a population as Canada. While protecting themselves by high tariffs from Canadian competition, the American capitalists are increasing their financial grip upon Canadian economy, while that of British imperialism is declining. This process has been going on for many years and is now becoming more marked. British investments in Canada (mostly in public utilities) reached a maximum of 2½ billions by 1914, while United States investments (mostly in basic industries) only getting under way by that date, reached a high total of 4 billion dollars by 1932.

Now, with the war on, the gap between British and United States investments in Canada is widening. Great Britain, to pay for her war purchases in Canada, is being forced to liquidate large amounts of her financial holdings there. Since the war began this liquidation amounts to about $300,000,000. In 1941 her deficit on Canadian war orders is expected to total $1,150,000,000, which the Canadians are expected to meet on a "lend-lease" basis. Meanwhile, the Yankee imperialists are losing no opportunity to improve their trade and financial position in Canada. Says Tim Buck, in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his article in *The Communist* for December, 1940: "The bourgeoisie anticipates big loans from the United States in the near future and the financial press made no bones about the belief that Secretary Morganthau's recent 'vacation' in Canada concerned such loans."

Political Pressure

The United States Government, together with its growing military domination of the Western Hemisphere and its attempts to control the economy of this vast and rich area, is also increasingly interfering in the political life of the peoples of the three Americas. This Yankee political interference takes place with regard to the composition of the governments of these peoples, the character of the masses' political discussion, the nature of their states' international trade relations, the disposition of specific legislation, and the general orientation of these countries toward the vital questions of peace and war. Innumerable examples might be cited of this expanding tendency of the United States to dictate politically to the rest of the countries of the whole hemisphere, to the detriment of their welfare and freedom.

Fortune, in its May number, cynically exposes the ruthlessness of Yankee imperialist policy in this respect. It says:

"Those governments that will play ball with the United States can expect aid. . . . But those that will not play ball can expect intervention of diverse degrees of sharpness. No electoral sovereignty or internal democracy can be permitted if it happens not to be pro-United States. Uncooperative governments will find credits called and refused, markets closed, their internal economies thrown into crisis, their political rivals publicly smiled on, and perhaps privately subsidized."

In Chile, through its instruments Davila, Grove and Schnake, Yankee imperialism recently tried, unsuccessfully, to break down the Popular Front and to secure a government more amenable to its demands. A loan was held out as a bait to the reactionaries for doing this work. In Cuba the recently attempted coup d'état against President Batista was organized by Cuban reactionary elements and United States intriguers, who hoped that by ousting Batista the plans of U. S. imperialism could be more readily executed. United States political pressure against Mexico is also an old story. There were lately the cases of silver and oil, as well as the insolent attempt of the Dies Committee to "investigate" Mexican internal affairs. And in the recent national election U. S. plotters worked openly to put into power the near-fascist Almazan and now they are busy taking the present President, Camacho, into camp. Said Secretary Encina of the Communist Party of Mexico at its recent Congress:

"The Yankee government and bankers furthered the plans of Almazan to organize an armed struggle in order to assault the power of the state and to implant a reac-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary dictatorship, submissive to the orders and wishes of Wall Street."

Similar examples of U. S. pressure are to be found in almost every other Latin American country. By the withholding or granting of loans, by refusing trade advantages, and by other means, weaker states are forced to make concessions. By various forms of bribery corrupt politicians are won for the service of Yankee imperialism. Panama was "induced" to cede a new strip of land for the Panama Canal; Bolivia was "encouraged" to yield on Standard Oil Company properties previously expropriated; Peru, upon U. S. insistence, took over the German Lufthansa; Colombia has canceled the German airline Scadta and replaced it by American planes and personnel; Nicaragua is now being brought into line to cede a route for a new canal doubly to protect United States lines of communication, etc., etc. Similar pressure was generally exercised to have the Latin American governments condemn the U.S.S.R. during the Finnish war. Pressure was also used to get them to seize the Axis powers' ships in their harbors.

Upon Canada also United States pressure is being exerted. The Roosevelt Administration is definitely supporting the amenable Mackenzie King Government and urging it on to a greater war effort. What the Yankee imperialists really think about Canadian national rights was expressed by Colonel Lindbergh when he insolently denied the right of Canada to wage war without the consent of the United States. An instance of the growing interference of the Yankee imperialists in Canadian affairs occurred recently in connection with the national budget. Finance Minister Ilsley had proposed to levy a tax of 15 per cent upon interest payments made to nationals of foreign countries. This hit the nearly half billion dollars that United States capitalists are sucking yearly out of the Canadian people, so they made a big protest. Says Thomas C. Sims in the *Inter-Continent News* of May 13: "Ottawa, the capital of Canada, was invaded last week. They came by air, in special chartered planes and in Pullman cars. They were not Germans, but Americans, high-ranking representatives of J. P. Morgan and other Wall Street tycoons. Their object: to change the Canadian budget." And they succeeded. Mr. Ilsley dropped his proposal.

In the general Pan-American conferences the United States makes a great show of democracy, of dealing with the Latin American countries as political equals. But this is window dressing. For the most part the meetings of the Pan-American Union confine themselves to broad political generalities. When it comes to concrete action the United States usually has its way by getting results through the various sub-committees which are loaded up with its agents or puppets, or, especially, by taking up such important matters as loans, tariffs, air bases, etc., with the individual countries, which are thus placed at a huge disadvantage in dealing singly with the more powerful United States. Especially dictatorial is the attitude of the U.S. toward the Caribbean countries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Political pressure by the United States upon Latin America and Canada now comes to a focus in the general plan of Yankee imperialism to use all these countries en bloc to further its world plans of conquest. The Lima, Panama and Havana Conferences were all carried on under heavy American pressure, directed to achieve this central purpose. The whole object has been to precipitate all the countries of the Western Hemisphere into the war under United States hegemony, despite the will to peace of their peoples. The latest step in carrying out this grandiose imperialist scheme was President Roosevelt's "unlimited emergency" speech of May 27. Without in any way consulting the Latin American people or their governments (even as he flouted the United States Congress and the anti-war sentiments of the American people) Mr. Roosevelt, speaking in the name of the whole Western Hemisphere, outlined a policy that constitutes virtually an undeclared war against Germany and dictatorially sought to commit all the nations of the three Americas to it.

The Ideological Campaign

Supporting its program of military, economic and political expansion, the United States Government is also conducting an active ideological drive throughout the Western Hemisphere. In Latin America this is based upon the so-called Good Neighbor policy. Every effort is being made—through radio, movies, press, diplomatic circles, business channels, delegations to and from the United States, etc.—to convince the suspicious Latin Americans that the United States means only good for their prosperity and national independence. Vice President Wallace, on I Am an American Day, glibly spoke of "a super-citizenship in America, the Western Hemisphere, where nations earnestly try to settle their disputes peacefully, without lying, treaty-breaking or aggression." Special efforts are being made to corrupt the intellectuals of Latin America.

This imperialist "educational" work is being conducted by that outstanding defender of freedom, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller. How his committee works is indicated in an article by Ricardo M. Setaro of Buenos Aires in the *Inter-Continent News*, dated May 24:

"Simultaneously 360 daily newspapers in Latin America began to publish weekly full page advertisements inviting Latin Americans to visit the United States. . . . It is estimated that this advertising campaign will cost nearly $10,000,000. This sum is being invested by the committee headed by Nelson Rockefeller."

To line up the Latin American countries behind the war program of the United States the central slogan is that of "Hemisphere defense." As the people of the United States are being tricked and pushed into the war by the Roosevelt Administration under pretenses of peace and national defense, so the same general line is being followed to involve the peace-loving Latin American peoples. The Pan-American Union, dominated by the United States, is pursuing a course that leads toward war. Its realized

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or proposed policies of the continental 300-mile safety belt, the occupation of foreign-held colonies, the seizure of Axis ships, the control of exports, the establishment of United States controlled naval-air bases, the vigorous anti-Soviet and anti-German propaganda campaigns, are all measures not in the interest of peace, but of war and Yankee imperialist expansion.

The United States is putting teeth into its ideological campaign for the "Good Neighbor" policy and "Hemisphere defense" by direct pressure upon public opinion in Latin America. At the Havana Conference, upon Secretary Hull's insistence, a resolution was adopted providing for joint action against "subversive" activities. Following this up, United States agents are now to be found allied with local reactionaries throughout Central and South America in every movement against the trade unions, the popular fronts, the Communist Parties, and the liberties generally of the Latin American peoples.

At present the Pan-American Union, upon U. S. initiation, is submitting a questionnaire to all the Latin American governments, inquiring minutely into "subversive" activities in their countries and regarding the measures that are being taken against them. This is obviously the prelude to an effort to foist upon the Latin American peoples a body of legislation restrictive of their liberties. It is an attempt to make the United States Department of Justice into a sort of general supervisor over the police departments of the Latin American countries. The growing American interference with Latin American internal affairs is emphasized by Mr. Wallace in his book, *The American Choice:*

"Our intentions toward all neighbors on this hemisphere are peaceful, but our swords and the Latin American neighbors' must be sharp enough to deal promptly with any open or underhand effort to carry out on this hemisphere the methods that ruined Europe."

This rhetoric, translated into life, means Wall Street's Big Stick policy for the hemisphere.

The social-reformists are, in the main, serving as willing tools of Yankee imperialism in Latin America. The American Federation of Labor leadership has resurrected the almost forgotten Pan-American Federation of Labor and is embarking upon a campaign to break up Latin American trade union opposition to the plans of the Wall Street imperialists. The Socialist Parties in various Latin American countries, with their characteristic theory that United States imperialism is "better" than German imperialism, are also active instruments of the Yankee imperialists in undermining the peoples' resistance. Thus, says Marmaduke Grove, outstanding leader of the Socialist Party of Chile: "Between these two imperialisms, the Socialist Party of Chile, having to make an agreement that would permit the safeguarding of our independence and an immediate economic adjustment of our future, considers the democratic imperialism as the most likely."

Canada, as well as Latin America, is also undergoing heavy ideological pressure from the United States. The American radio, press, movies,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

etc., are now carrying on an unprecedented deluge of propaganda in Canada, singing the praises of United States imperialism. This propaganda, although somewhat less condescending in tone than that directed toward Latin America, has a "big brother" note in it that forecasts the minor role intended for Canada. In the campaign to strengthen the Yankee grip upon Canada, the American reformist leaders of the A. F. of L., Railroad Brotherhoods, and C.I.O., who officially control most of the Canadian trade union movement, are doing their full part; while the Social-Democratic political organizations in Canada, by supporting the Anglo-American war alliance, are also easing the march of the Wall Street imperialists into Canada.

The Inter-Imperialist Struggle

By means of all the maneuvers and campaigns described above, Yankee imperialism has greatly strengthened its position in the Western Hemisphere at the expense of its chief imperialist rivals, Great Britain and Germany, and also at the cost of the many American peoples. The spreading of the great American Hemisphere military network has definitely given the United States a big advantage. Especially has England's position been weakened in the New World. As R. P. Dutt says in the *New Masses* (Dec. 17, 1940) regarding the new American bases in British colonies in the Americas: "In spite of all the anxious denials of any change of sovereignty . . . the lease of ninety-nine years is equivalent to cession."

Politically also, the United States has made Hemisphere advances, to the detriment of Great Britain and Germany. Through the Pan-American Union, which the United States controls and dominates, it has managed to secure, to its own great advantage, some degree of unity, however shaky, of the 20 Latin American republics behind its imperialist plan of "Hemisphere defense." In many Latin American countries, Yankee influence over the corrupt ruling political circles has also been substantially increased. Especially is this true of the countries in the Caribbean area. Moreover, an increase of American political influence in Canada is to be noted.

By their economic offensive the Yankee imperialists have also strengthened themselves in the markets of Latin America. The *Labor Fact Book* 5 (page 24) states that, "During the first year of the war U. S. exports to Latin America rose 42 per cent over the previous 12-month period." And Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller (*N. Y. Times*, May 12) asserts, "In the first quarter of 1941 our purchases [from Latin America] were 41 per cent higher than in the first quarter of 1940." Meanwhile, England's trade in this vast area remains virtually at stationary levels, while that of Germany, because of the British blockade, has been almost completely wiped out.

Great Britain and Germany, however, are not standing idly by while the United States strives to oust them from this great and rich territory. At the Lima, Panama and Havana conferences they tried to block the path of Yankee imperialism, but with no important success. Both of them, too, are resisting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every step to extend United States trade in Latin America. Even during the war England has sent important trade delegations into South America to strengthen its trade lines, and tried, ineffectively, a price-cutting trade war against the United States in Argentina. Germany, with its restricted means, also stubbornly resists Yankee penetration, and Japan is carrying on a big trade drive in the West Coast South American countries.

In Canada, also, British imperialism is stubbornly contesting the economic and political encroachments of Yankee imperialism.

Despite its successes, however, the United States has by no means decisively defeated its imperialist rivals in the Western Hemisphere. Increasingly, Latin America will become a rich stake and a battleground in the world struggle of the imperialist powers. After the war this territory doubtless will be the scene of a fierce trade struggle; especially should the Nazis emerge militarily victorious or semi-victorious. The Nazis have their greedy eyes fastened upon Latin America, and if opportunity presents, will try to impose upon it a slavery even worse than that which they have forced upon the occupied countries in Europe. Germany has a strong trade organization and a powerful grip upon the armies and governments of many Latin American states; it also knows how to utilize demagogically the sentiments of the masses against Yankee imperialism; and, most important, it will exploit the fact that the Latin American peoples are compelled to trade with Europe, as the United States is unable to buy more than 50 per cent of their exportable commodities.

The Resistance of the Peoples

Throughout the Western Hemisphere Yankee imperialism, with its program of war, conquest, enslavement and exploitation, is meeting with increasing opposition from the popular masses of the various countries. In Latin America especially, this opposition is acute and growing. It is also to be found in Canada and in the U. S. itself.

The national liberation movement in Latin America has grown greatly in the last few years. The trade unions have become strong (Mexico 600,000; Chile 350,000; Cuba 300,000; Argentina 300,000); the peasant movement has also made big strides; the students and professionals have become active; and some sections of the native bourgeoisie have been drawn into the movement. The national liberation struggle has reached its highest expression so far in the Popular Front movement of Chile, Mexico and Cuba, and in pronounced progressive trends in Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela and other countries. The Communist Parties are playing a big role in all this democratic development. More and more the vast popular forces are putting themselves athwart the path of advancing Yankee imperialism. Increasingly the many peoples sense the danger of the active military, economic and political policies of the United States and are making resistance to the maneuvers of the American imperialists.

The Latin American peoples do not take kindly to the type of inter-American "unity" developed by the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pan-American Union, despite the seeming unanimity of their political heads at the various conferences of this body. They sense in this so-called Pan-American unity a developing United States domination. Consequently, very few of the decisions of the Pan-American Union conferences have been ratified by the respective Latin American governments. This is true of the vital resolutions adopted by the Havana Conference. Alarmed at this situation, bourgeois leaders in Latin America are now demanding an immediate conference of the various American Republics, "so that an emergency would not find this hemisphere as disunited as the Balkans were." (*N. Y. Times,* June 3.)

The peoples of Latin America, sharing popular opinion in the United States and Canada, do not want the war that the Roosevelt Government is trying to force them into. A writer in *Fortune* (May) says that in Argentina, "The slogans of 'neutrality' and 'national liberation' bring wild cheers from audiences," and the same is also true in every other country of the Western Hemisphere. President Roosevelt's belligerent "fireside chat" of May 27, in which, arbitrarily setting aside democratic processes, he undertook to outline a war program for the hemisphere, was received coldly, even in official circles, in the countries south of the "bulge" that are least under United States domination.

Latin American opinion also opposes the establishment of air-naval bases with which the United States is trying to encircle the Hemisphere. The peoples of Latin America remember vividly that between 1900 and 1929 United States armed forces were used 36 times against their countries. So far, despite heavy pressure, the desired bases have not been conceded by any countries outside of the Caribbean area. *Fortune* (May) gives an inkling of mass Latin American resistance on this question:

"Opposition to the bases among the Argentine people is universal and unanimous. Most significant proof is that no political leader, even one who is pro-U.S., has dared come out openly in favor of them. It would be political suicide under democratic procedure. . . . Across the Plata estuary they have had before their eyes an obvious object lesson. President Baldomir of Uruguay, who publicly supported the bases, is fighting for his political life."

The Latin American peoples are also resisting the political intrigues of Yankee imperialism in their respective countries. Witness how they defeated the putsch against Batista in Cuba, the projected Almazan revolt in Mexico and also the attempt to destroy the Chilean Popular Front. In the same anti-imperialist spirit the peoples of Colombia and Venezuela have recently carried through progressive national elections. Many similar anti-imperialist movements are to be noted in Argentina, Bolivia, Peru, Puerto Rico, etc. Resistance to Yankee imperialism is also found in the economic sphere, as evidenced by the refusal of Chile to accept an American loan upon the hard terms laid down, and by the insistence by Brazil that it be allowed to build a steel mill out

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of its loan from the United States.

Symptomatic of the growing hostility in Latin America against Yankee imperialism is the mass demand now sweeping these countries for the release of Earl Browder. Seeing in Comrade Browder a resolute fighter against imperialist domination and linking up his name with Carlos Prestes, the trade unions, peasant organizations, student bodies, liberal newspapers, etc., all over Latin America are insisting that he be set free. The movement has taken on such great proportions that it has become a real thorn in the side of the American State Department.

In Canada anti-U.S. imperialist sentiment is also rising. In spite of the much boasted-of unfortified frontier between the United States and Canada, the Canadian people have long been suspicious of the good intentions of the Wall Street moguls who have been so rapidly securing control over their most vital industries. This suspicion is growing into alarm as the masses of the Canadian people observe the obvious steps of the United States Government, aided by important sections of the Canadian bourgeoisie, to bring Canada more and more under its influence. Thus, the Mutual Defense Pact and the Hyde Park Pact have caused much popular uneasiness. And President Roosevelt's condescending offers to "defend" Canada provoked such an unfavorable reaction in that country that Prime Minister King, although a close collaborator with Roosevelt, felt called upon to state publicly that what Canada wanted was not protection from the United States but to engage with it in a common defense effort. The looming threat of United States domination is bound to play more and more of a role in Canadian politics.

In the United States proper democratic opposition to Yankee imperialist conquest of the Western Hemisphere is confused and not well organized. The workers and farmers of the United States naturally have no desire to oppress or exploit the other peoples of the Hemisphere, but they do not see clearly en masse that such domination, by strengthening reaction in the United States and by plunging this country into endless wars, would also work against the people's interests in this country, as well as against those of the other peoples of the Hemisphere. The mass opposiiton in this country to American imperialism takes on rather the more general form of a stubborn struggle against the policy of plunging the United States into the war and against the policies of dictatorship and exploitation of Yankee imperialism at home. Meanwhile, American Federation of Labor leaders and C.I.O. leaders of the Hillman brand are trying to utilize their trade unions to strengthen the drive of Yankee imperialism in Latin America, and "peace" advocates such as Lindbergh, Wheeler, Norman Thomas, etc., each with his own argumentation, definitely try to lure the people into supporting a United States conquest of the Western Hemisphere.

The American Peoples Versus Yankee Imperialism

The many peoples of the three Americas have a common interest in preventing the realization of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wall Street's "New Order" for the Western Hemisphere. Yankee imperialism, like British and German imperialism, has nothing to offer the toiling masses of this Hemisphere, including the United States, except poverty, exploitation, fascism and war. Throughout the Hemisphere, therefore, the people's forces of democracy, peace and progress should unite to prevent the consummation of these disasters. Especially should the peoples of Canada and the United States realize the necessity for collaboration with the democratic masses of Latin America against the common menace of Wall Street imperialism.

To bring about such unity, however, these great democratic forces must clearly understand that United States imperialism now definitely constitutes the most threatening imperialist danger to the Latin American peoples; that President Roosevelt has long since abandoned his limited reform program and is now the chief spokesman for Wall Street; that his "Good Neighbor" policy is only an ideological screen for an aggressive Yankee imperialism; that the so-called Hemisphere defense policy in reality is an attempt of the United States to establish military hegemony over the other American countries and to swing them behind its war program of world imperialist conquest; that the developing economic and political "collaboration" between the United States and the rest of the countries of the Hemisphere is taking forms that are resulting in Wall Street domination. Much confusion still exists among the anti-imperialist forces upon all these questions, with the consequent serious weakening of the people's movement.

Unity of program and action among the Latin American peoples is especially needed. The policy of these states of dealing one by one with the United States on vital questions is disastrous. Only when they move in a bloc can they hope to present a sufficient counterweight to that of the United States. Already there are many signs of a growing Latin American unity, especially indicated by the establishment of the Latin American Confederation of Labor and the holding of many conferences among the Latin-American peoples upon various economic, political and cultural questions. One such conference was held recently in Montevideo between representatives of Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, Bolivia and Brazil. Another took place in Haiti, among the Caribbean countries, including Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Mexico, Dominican Republic, San Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama. Plans are also now going forward for an Amazon conference of nations drained by that great river. All these Latin American conferences and unity developments are looked upon with hostility by the U. S. State Department as infringements upon the role of the Pan-American Union, which it dominates and controls.

The basis for a real Latin American unity, in the various countries and internationally, is the People's Front, founded upon an alliance between the workers and peasants. Considerable sections of the bourgeoisie usually support this anti-imperialist movement; but, because of the deepening economic crisis in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their countries, the closing of foreign markets against them, the increased political and military pressure from the imperialists, and their fear of the growing democratic spirit of the people, many of the native capitalists are inclined to yield to one group or another of the rival imperialists, especially those of Wall Street.

Everywhere the workers in Latin America must be the leaders in the struggle against imperialism. And only to the extent that they establish democracy in their own countries by breaking down the domination of the many dictators of the Vargas and Trujillo type can they hope to create an effective defense against Yankee imperialism.

The most urgent task now in the Hemisphere anti-imperialist struggle is the fight for peace. The Latin American peoples should refuse to be a tail to the war plans of Yankee imperialism. In the same spirit the Canadian people are increasingly demanding that their country withdraw from the war. In the United States the slogan that correctly expresses the people's sentiments is "Get out and stay out of the war." The Anglo-American war alliance offers nothing to the peoples of the Americas except endless slaughter and enslavement. The correct orientation for the nations of this Hemisphere should be toward a people's peace, based upon principles of no annexations and no indemnities, and put through in collaboration with the Soviet Union and the democratic masses of the world.

Inseparable from this struggle for world peace is the necessity to prevent Yankee imperialism from militarily dominating this Hemisphere. There must be no United States air and naval bases upon Latin American or Canadian soil, no military "protection" of the other American countries by the United States. Democratically governed and united among themselves, these countries will be well able to protect their peoples against imperialist aggression, whether it should come from abroad or from within the Hemisphere.

A halt must also be put to the political interference of Yankee imperialism in the life of the smaller American peoples. Full national independence for all the states of the Western Hemisphere should be a rallying cry for the anti-imperialist forces throughout North, Central and South America. The establishment of national independence has long been an urgent issue throughout Latin America. Now the strengthening and defense of its national independence, especially as against the advance of United States imperialism, is also becoming a major issue in Canada. As the beleaguered British Empire weakens and its connections with its American possessions loosen, and as the United States reaches out to grab these dominions and colonies, the Canadian people are finding it more and more necessary to defend themselves against their powerful neighbor to the South who is so anxious to "protect" them. The island colonies of France and other countries that may be "taken over" also must not be allowed to become mere United States colonies, under pretenses of joint Pan-American control, but should be granted the right of self-determination.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The struggle of the Latin American peoples for national liberation must have its economic base. These countries need to prevent the United States from monopolizing their markets by ruthless trade drives, by control of export of "war materials," and other devices. These countries need imperatively to insist upon the right to trade freely with the rest of the world, without United States interference. Furthermore, instead of supporting a general customs union, to include the United States, the Latin American countries should cultivate freer trading relations amongst themselves. United States loans to the Latin American countries must not bear restrictions tending to reduce the latter's economies into colonial adjuncts to the United States industrial system, but should be so formulated as to allow the necessary fully-rounded-out industrialization. The nationalization of key resources and industries now held by U. S. and other imperialist interests in Latin America is also imperative for a sound economic system in those countries.

The present vigorous ideological drive of Yankee imperialism by means of the press, radio, delegations of movie stars, political pressure, etc., throughout the Hemisphere should be countered by the development of an active propaganda for peace, democracy and socialism. It is high time that the anti-imperialist forces of the Hemisphere utilize the great educational opportunities that are at their disposal in their many organizations.

In the far-flung struggle that is developing throughout the Western Hemisphere between Yankee imperialism and the people's forces of democracy and progress the latter are potentially by far the stronger. But they still grievously lack unity of organization and program. In building this great movement, to keep our Hemisphere from being enslaved by reactionary, war-making capitalists, no body of workers has a greater responsibility than those in the United States.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BROWDER'S CONTRIBUTION TOWARD DEVELOPING A PROGRESSIVE TRADE UNIONISM

BY JACK JOHNSTONE

THE imprisonment of Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, a typical labor frame-up that the American bourgeoisie is famous for the world over, also shows the weakness of American capitalism, its fear of the masses, expressed in the underhanded attack by Roosevelt, who personally directed the frame-up. The warmongers feared to charge Browder and the Party he leads with his real "crime"—opposition to their war policy and the general attack against the living standards and working conditions of the working class and against civil liberties, as a means of forcing an unwilling people into the war.

Browder has spent a lifetime of struggle in the interests of the working class, as a trade union leader, as the outstanding Communist leader, as a fighter for democracy, for peace and for socialism.

The hatred that Roosevelt and the reactionary leaders of the trade unions have for Browder is not a hatred that has developed only since he became General Secretary of the Communist Party. This hatred goes back to the days of the last World War, when Gompers was President Wilson's chief lieutenant within the ranks of labor, to the days when Hillman, now playing the same role for President Roosevelt, collaborated with and pretended to believe in the program of the Trade Union Educational League, led by Foster and Browder. Browder, unlike Hillman, could not be corrupted. Prison doors open to receive leaders of the Browder type. The doors of the White House open for leaders of the Hillman type. Browder believes in what he says; he practices what he preaches; he has the courage needed in a working class leader. He has never kept silent on any vital issue, no matter what the consequences for him.

In 1912 Browder, a leading progressive trade unionist and Left-wing Socialist in Kansas City, made his first acquaintance with William Z. Foster. Foster was then on one of his many tours in an effort to weld together the numerous local progressive forces within the A. F. of L., so that a serious struggle could be carried on against the reactionary policy of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, led by Samuel Gompers. Browder, a delegate to the local central labor body of Kansas City, was already then a recognized

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leader of the progressive trade union forces. A few years later he fought against America's entrance into the imperialist war of 1914-18 and against the reactionary war program of Gompers and the national leaders of the Socialist Party. Then, as today, he was sent to prison for his opposition to the imperialist war. He had to continue his education in Leavenworth, where a number of other class war victims were imprisoned. In spite of prison restrictions, he was able to organize and teach a class in Marxism. Coming out of prison in 1920, a stronger and more able leader than when he had entered jail, he joined hands with Foster in the national leadership of the Left-wing forces in the trade union movement, organizing the progressives of that day into the Trade Union Educational League.

Under the leadership of these two great Americans, Browder and Foster, and with the cooperation of the recently organized Communist Party, much progress was made in the trade union movement; thousands of trade union progressives were drawn into the Trade Union Educational League.

Great campaigns were waged by the T.U.E.L. in favor of amalgamation of craft unions and for organizing the mass production industries, auto, steel, metal, etc., on an industrial basis. From 1920 to 1924 this program won the support of the great majority of the membership of the A. F. of L., and the official endorsement of a dozen of the most decisive State Federations of Labor, scores of important Central Labor Councils and some fourteen international trade union conventions, including the main shop craft and maintenance-of-way unions in the railroad industry. Victory for the progressive industrial union bloc within the A. F. of L. seemed certain, and labor appeared to be at a turning point—the start—of a tremendous drive to organize the unorganized in the basic industries of the country and to get rid of the labor lieutenants of big business, who feared their own membership, and who kept the trade unions divided in ruinous craft jurisdictional quarrels, a leadership which deliberately kept the mass production industries unorganized.

Browder, in an article in the December, 1922, issue of *The Labor Herald*, official organ of the T.U.E.L., of which he was editor, entitled "What Are You Going to Do About It, Mr. Gompers?" put the question:

"Over a million workers, Mr. Gompers, have called upon you and your associates in the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, to take action to amalgamate the divided crafts into a series of powerful industrial unions. They are weary of having a dozen or two organizations in a single industry and are tired of being licked because they cannot present a united front. They demand solidarity. What are you going to do about it, Mr. Gompers?"

Gompers gave his answer taking his cue from President Wilson, who had earlier unleashed a campaign of terror with the infamous Palmer raids. Gompers adopted a Red-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

baiting expulsion policy, giving the lead to his henchmen by expelling from the A. F. of L. the federal union of office workers of New York City on the charge that they were led by "Reds." This was followed by a whole series of mass expulsions under the smokescreen of "Communist control," such as we hear so much of again today; hundreds of thousands of progressive trade unionists were expelled. The so-called Socialist trade union leaders of that day led the Red-baiting pack, as they are doing today.

In line with the expulsion of the militant elements from the unions was the intensification of the ruinous policy of class collaboration. One typical expression of it was the so-called B. & O. Plan. It is interesting to note the similarity of that so-called model agreement of nearly twenty years ago, hailed as such by Gompers, Frey and Hillman, and the "model" agreement that Hillman, Frey and John Green are trying to fasten today upon the workers in the ship building industry as the 1941 model plan for all labor.

The B. & O. Plan was so named because it was first put into effect on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, as a result of the betrayal of the great railroad strike of 1922. It outlawed the class struggle; there were to be no strikes; the trade union leaders agreed to become partners with the management in enforcing efficiency plans to speed up production. The workers' share in this plan was a "promise" of steady employment and of higher wages through increased production per man. Later, the anti-working class principles of this plan were embodied in the Watson-Parker law, and, finally, in the creation of the Railroad Labor Board, set up by law during the Coolidge regime.

The agreement recently signed by Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the A. F. of L., for the shipyard workers of the Pacific Coast, and agreed to by Hillman in behalf of Roosevelt, and by John Green, National President of the C.I.O. shipyard workers union,—which these misleaders have labeled a model agreement, and are attempting to put into effect in both the Pacific and Atlantic Coast shipyards—is much worse than the B. & O. Plan. It is an agreement that at the outset accepted a wage-cut, in face of the workers' demand for a wage increase. It lengthened the work-week from five to six days, against the opposition of the great majority of shipyard workers. It froze wages at the wage-cut level. It surrendered the right to strike and accepted compulsory arbitration. It embodied the vicious principles contained in the Vinson Bill. It meant essentially the conscription of industrial labor during the period of the war. It was entered into, not by the workers either of the A. F. of L. or the C.I.O., who are fighting against it, but by reactionary leaders of both the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. It puts into effect the traitorous class collaboration policy of the A. F. of L. Executive, and challenges the official policy and fighting program of the CIO.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Browder, as a national leader of the Trade Union Educational League, gave all of his great ability and leadership to the workers in the struggle against the ruinous class collaboration policy of the earlier period, which aimed to tie labor to a no-strike program in the interests of the big corporations; and he has consistently fought such treacherous policies ever since.

In his pamphlet *Class Struggle vs. Class Collaboration*, written over sixteen years ago, in analyzing the B. & O. agreement, Browder wrote:

"It is an agreement whereby the union purchases recognition from the railroad management by supplying efficiency engineers who, with the authority of the union behind them, speed up production, reduce wages, eliminate waste, reduce the cost of production and eliminate undesirable workers and union rules that hamper efficiency in profit making."

That was true then, and is true today of similar agreements. How well this analysis fits Hillman's and Frey's 1941 model agreement which they are trying to force upon the shipyard workers! All that has to be added to that paragraph is: "and conscript labor in the interests of the war program of the Roosevelt administration."

Today, however, the reactionary class-collaborationist trade union leaders face a much more advanced trade union movement than they did in the '20s when they put over the B. & O. plan, a trade union movement rooted in the basic industries of the country. Under the C.I.O. the new militant industrial unions have established themselves firmly in the mass production industries. They have developed thousands of local and district progressive trade union leaders. The official position of the C.I.O., as expressed in the resolution of the last convention and decisions of the Executive Board, is against this policy of surrender of Hillman, Green and Frey, as is the membership of the A. F. of L. A bold leadership can defeat this Red-baiting, anti-working class, class-collaboration, pro-war program.

Then, as today, the Communist Party played an important role in the struggle to organize the unorganized, for industrial unionism, against class collaboration and for labor's independent political action. The imprisonment of Earl Browder is therefore a direct attack, not alone against Browder or the Communist Party, but a blow struck at the working class.

With the Red-baiting expulsion of the Communists and militants from the trade unions and the intensification of the policy of class collaboration, the complete bankruptcy of the A. F. of L. leadership became more and more apparent. All attempts of the progressive elements led by the T.U.E.L. to break through the reactionary stranglehold on the A. F. of L. unions, or to force the official leadership to adopt a policy of struggle and to organize the workers in the basic industries, proved of no avail. With the cooperation of the Communist Party, the Trade Union Educational League was compelled independently to undertake the task of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizing the unorganized and of giving leadership to workers engaged in strike struggles. It actually began to function as an independent trade union center, and in recognition of this fact it changed its name to Trade Union Unity League.

The Trade Union Unity League became the national trade union center to which were affiliated dozens of small but militant progressive industrial unions in auto, steel, metal, mining, textile, marine, lumber, shoe, food, needle, etc., as well as rank-and-file progressive groups within the existing A. F. of L. craft unions. For a number of years the Trade Union Unity League conducted the only campaigns to organize the unorganized in the mass production industries, leading strike struggles for wage increases, better working conditions and for the right of collective bargaining against the labor-hating big corporations.

In the early '30s, however, the trade union movement experienced a vital change. Under the impact of the economic crisis, the militancy of the workers rose so high that it could no longer be blocked by the A. F. of L. bureaucracy. Under these conditions, the T.U.U.L., influenced by the Communist Party under Comrade Browder's leadership, decided to give up its independent existence. The membership of its affiliates went into the A. F. of L., in many cases furnishing the nucleus for the new unions which later grew so powerful in the C.I.O.

It was the persistent activities of the T.U.E.L. and T.U.U.L., in which the contributions and leadership of Comrade Browder played such an important role, which prepared the ground and to a considerable extent developed the forces that made possible the historic advance of the of the C.I.O.

The new turn in the American labor movement since the formation labor movement began to take definite shape at the 55th Convention of the A. F. of L. in 1935. Despite the fact that, at the time when the 55th convention of the A. F. of L. met, there were only four million workers organized in the trade unions, and that the basic industries were still unorganized, Browder quickly recognized that this convention, in spite of the domination of the reactionary forces under the leadership of Green, marked a turning point in labor history. Browder declared:

"At the present time the American labor movement has reached the decisive turning point in its history. The 55th Convention of the American Federation of Labor marked the beginning of a new era for the trade unions in this country. The struggles that took place at the convention between the reactionary leadership of Green, Woll, Frey and Hutchinson, and the industrial union bloc, under the leadership of John L. Lewis, the head of the United Mine Workers Union, were among the most important in the whole history of the American Federation of Labor. The old policies of collaboration with the bosses, of refusing to organize the mass production industries, of crippling the working class by keeping it within the rigid mold of narrow craft unions, were under severe fire. The hope and desire of the workers for a strong labor movement, able to fight for their immediate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic interests, and able to act as a powerful barrier against the growing menace of fascism, was reflected in the policies of the industrial union bloc. . . ."

The illegal expulsion from the A. F. of L. of the industrial union bloc was a severe blow to labor unity, giving open encouragement to monopoly capital to resist with force and violence every effort made to organize the mass production industries. The Greens, Wolls and Freys very quickly labeled the C.I.O. as "red" and undertook to give full assistance to Big Business in their effort to destroy the C.I.O. They followed the C.I.O. with their union-and-strike-breaking efforts in every campaign, from the first great steel drive to the latest drive in Ford. In spite of these disruptive, splitting tactics, the trade unions, since the 55th Convention of the A. F. of L., have almost tripled their total membership.

The C.I.O., from its inception, adopted a progressive program based on the most burning needs of the workers and developed a militant, successful, organizational campaign. At the same time, while basing its immediate political orientation on an alignment with the New Deal wing in the Democratic Party, it took the preliminary step toward mobilizing labor into an independent political force by organizing the Labor's Non-Partisan League. It was during this period, after the failure of the N.R.A. to curb labor, that Roosevelt changed his tactics to a middle-of-the-road policy. The rapid growth of the C.I.O. accelerated the growth of the independent political movement among the workers throughout the country. Browder mobilized the Communist Party's full strength throughout the country, in order to strengthen this political development and to weld the progressive forces into a united people's movement, into a broad Farmer-Labor Party, in preparation for the 1936 Presidential elections. Analyzing the issues and parties, he said:

"There are two chief and opposite directions of possible development in American political life in the 1936 elections. All parties and groups must be judged by their relation to two fundamental political tendencies." (*The People's Front*, International Publishers, New York, p. 22.)

"The two poles of this re-crystallization of our political life are, on the reactionary side, the forces gathered around Landon and Knox —Hearst, the Liberty League, the Jeffersonian Democrats, Wall Street, all the forces of organized wealth and monopoly; on the progressive side, all the mass organizations of the people, which are moving in the direction of a new party, a Farmer-Labor Party.

"Roosevelt and the Democratic Party do not represent either of these sides in the basic realignment. Roosevelt tries to take the middle-of-the-road course, tries to satisfy both sides of an irreconcilable struggle, and therefore satisfies neither. In the Solid South, traditional base of the Democratic Party, the ruling class still votes Democratic but already prays Republican. In the border states, the wealthy best families march openly into the Landon camp bearing the banner of Jefferson. Senator Glass

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

announces that his own election on the Democratic ticket will be a victory for the Republican Party. The Democratic Party is a house divided, two souls struggling for one body, a political Hamlet moving inexorably to its tragic end." (*The People's Front*, pp. 81-2.)

Important advances were registered in the city and state elections of 1934 and 1935 in the independent political action of labor in coalition with the farmers and other groups, through local independent political organizations, including the trade unions under the leadership of the C.I.O., acting principally through Labor's Non-Partisan League. Needless to say, the Communist Party, as well as individual Communists, played an important role in building this growing united people's movement. Browder had a far-reaching influence in the efforts to crystallize these rapidly growing local political united fronts into a powerful national Farmer-Labor Party. He worked closely with many trade unionists, leaders and rank and file, with many leaders of the farmers, etc., presenting for discussion a five-point program covering the most pressing needs of the people.

The national Farmer-Labor Party Conference held in Chicago in May, 1935, at the call of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party and Governor Floyd Olsen, adopted a progressive platform embodying the main principles outlined in Browder's five-point program. The Chicago Conference received considerable support throughout the country. The National Committee of our Party gave its full support to the conference, its decisions and its platform. It appeared as if here was a solid foundation upon which could be built a broad united Farmer-Labor Party capable of stopping the reactionary forces in America and able, in the 1936 elections, to send a bloc of true representatives of the people to Congress.

However, the chains that had bound the trade unions to the two old capitalist parties had not yet been broken. While the great majority of the organizations that made up the Farmer-Labor Party movement had broken away from the two old parties, nevertheless, the C.I.O. and the progressive trade unions in the A. F. of L., although they had created Labor's Non-Partisan League as an independent political organization, decided to support Roosevelt for re-election, and, in the main, to work within the Democratic Party. While the Communist Party had serious disagreements with this policy of dependence upon Roosevelt, and put forward its own candidates for President and Vice-President, Browder and Ford, it fully cooperated with and participated in the efforts to promote independent progressive political formations of workers, farmers and city middle class strata. Comrade Browder consistently endeavored to clarify the issues before the people, the role of the parties and the Presidential candidates, Landon and Roosevelt. While concentrating his main fire on Landon as the standard-bearer of reactionary monopoly capital, he at the same time warned the toil-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing masses against depending upon Roosevelt. He said:

"Roosevelt's course has been a series of retreats before the offensive of reaction. His administration is allowing itself to be dragged more and more onto the path of Hearst.

"It had long been the hope of the Communist Party that we would go into the Presidential election this year (1936) with a Farmer-Labor National Ticket.

"The Communist Party declares that it is a fatal mistake to depend upon Roosevelt to check the attacks of Wall Street, or advance the interests and demands of the masses of the people." *(Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.)

History has proved the correctness of Browder's estimate of Roosevelt, and the costly error of depending upon Roosevelt, made by the progressive trade unions.

With the outbreak of the second imperialist war Roosevelt shaped his policy deliberately toward America's participation, in the interest of American imperialism, to hew out of this war an American empire that would dominate the world.

Roosevelt proceeded to unite the bourgeoisie for this war program and to gather around him, particularly within the trade union movement, those leaders on whom he could rely for support in the efforts to chain labor to the war program; leaders who would use all their influence to confuse the workers and the great majority of the people who were against war.

Roosevelt's open break with Lewis was the go-ahead signal for big business to redouble its attack against the working class. The attack was greatly intensified after the election, having now the open support of the Administration, as Roosevelt proceeded more and more openly to drag the United States into the war. In spite of the treacherous efforts of the class collaborationist leaders labor has displayed great militancy in meeting this attack. However, labor's role in the 1940 elections revealed its still existing political immaturity. The Farmer-Labor Party forces, which showed such great promise prior to the 1936 elections, which placed so much confidence in Roosevelt, found themselves faced in the 1940 elections with two candidates, Roosevelt and Willkie, both of whom represented the same Wall Street war program, both of whom favored conscription, talking of peace and preparing for war. While many of the progressive trade unions and their leaders were distrustful of Roosevelt, and many of them refused to endorse him, they did not yet have a Farmer-Labor Party candidate in the field, and were not ready to support the Communist Party candidate, Browder, and the Communist Party election platform. Labor remained a prisoner of the capitalist two-party system.

While John L. Lewis, during the election period, broke with Roosevelt, the leader of the war party, he fell captive for a moment, but at the decisive moment, to the rival candidate for leadership of the war party, Willkie. In a statement published as an editorial in *The Sunday*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Worker on the eve of the election, Browder, while taking issue with Lewis on the endorsement of Willkie, again showed keen understanding in exposing the class-collaborationists who now unleashed a sharp attack on Lewis as part of their effort to hitch labor to the Roosevelt war machine. Browder declared:

"With Lewis' scorching excoriation of the betrayal of Roosevelt, of his adventurous playing with the welfare, lives, and peace of the people, a profound assent arises from the masses, a deep-voiced 'Amen.' That is a truth most necessary for the spokesmen of progressive labor and the people to utter loudly and clearly. . . .

"But the unconditional endorsement of Willkie, as the opposite of Roosevelt, flies in the face of truth and common sense. It transcends even the moss-grown plausibilities of the 'lesser evil' theory. It is incredible. It strikes no answering chord among the masses. . . .

"There can be nothing but contempt for the howls and caviling against Lewis, which come from the camp of Roosevelt's 'labor' lieutenants. Among these Lilliputians, Lewis has stood forth as a giant. They have groveled at the feet of the war machine and would deliver labor in chains for the reward of Roosevelt's smile. Lewis has at least tried to bargain for some definite gain as the price of labor's vote, even though such bargain is dubious and unsound and dangerous for the future.

"The Communists have no part or parcel with endorsement of Willkie, unconditional or otherwise." (*The Way Out*, International Publishers, New York, pp. 147-48.)

The great influence and leadership of Browder over large numbers of workers in the trade unions and progressive trade union leaders, helped to clarify the issues and the role of the parties and candidates. Roosevelt and his "labor" lieutenants saw in Browder a leader whose influence among the masses was growing rapidly, a man whose ideas and growing popularity were to be feared, a candidate representing the only political party which was presenting to the people an election program that grew out of the needs of the people, and which, if permitted freely to exercise the rights guaranteed to political parties, was likely to succeed in winning a significant minority vote that would hamper Roosevelt's program for the entrance of the United States into the war.

The attacks led by Roosevelt and his "labor" lieutenants against the Communist Party were directed not only at the Communist Party but at the entire working class; every progressive trade union leader was labeled "Communist," and every strike and struggle of the workers for better conditions was declared to be "Communist-led."

The struggle within the trade union movement today is on the question of what kind of a trade union movement it shall be, what shall be its program, strategy and tactics. Shall it be based upon the needs and interests of the working class, as expressed in the official policy of the C.I.O.? Or shall it be a trade union movement based upon the no-strike, compulsory arbitration policy, upon surrender to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt program of plunging America into the war? This is the official policy of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, which is shared by the Hillman minority in the C.I.O. That is the question at issue today. It is a struggle between the forces of war and reaction and the forces of democratic progress and peace.

The real reason for Roosevelt's Declaration of an Unlimited National Emergency was revealed very quickly with the breaking of the strike of the aircraft workers of Inglewood, California, in which he was given full cooperation by Hillman, Frankensteen and company. It is the workers' demands for decent wages, for the right to collective bargaining, for the right to strike when strikes are forced upon them by the profit-mad monopolies, that the Roosevelt administration and its labor lieutenants are determined to suppress.

While the aircraft workers' strike was broken, their demands still remain, and their demands will be won. The strike was broken; but the struggle for the right to strike has only begun. This is a new test both for the leadership and the membership of the trade union movement. The warmongers and their lieutenants within the ranks of labor were not able to abolish the right to strike by consent. Now they are trying to suppress this vital right of the workers by force. But they have a much stronger, more politically advanced, working class to deal with—a trade union movement 10,000,000 strong, rooted in the basic industries, representing more than 8,000,000 working class families, 30,000,000 people, that influences millions of people outside the trade unions. Comrade Browder has pointed out the great change that has taken place in the relationship of forces with the emergence of this new trade union movement; as follows:

"The most far-reaching and significant development in American life in the period reaching from the First World War down to today, when the U. S. has entered the Second World War, is the emergence of the *organized labor movement* as a mass phenomenon, as a decisive force in the life of the nation. The growth in *volume* of trade union membership, to its present figure of nine to ten millions, registers an advance in *quality* which marks the emergence of the working class as a conscious participant on the stage of history, a fundamental change in the relationship of classes." (*The Path of Browder and Foster,* Workers Library Publishers, New York, p. 13.)

In the few short years that the C.I.O. has been in existence the trade union movement has literally leaped ahead, particularly in those industries that never were organized before. In the last year and in particular in the last few months some great achievements were registered in organizing the unorganized, in obtaining wage increases and better working conditions. This has tremendously strengthened the progressive trade union forces. They are stronger today than they ever were before in the history of American labor. They influence and lead millions of progressives outside of the trade union movement.

The struggles of the trade unions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

today, in direct connection with their economic demands upon the employers, against anti-labor legislation, against all attempts to curb by law the democratic rights of the people and the rights of the trade unions, cannot but bring growing conscious understanding of labor's need of its own independent political program. It must bring a realization that big business reaction through their lawyer and poll-tax Congressmen have control of the government, that labor has been too long a prisoner of the tweedle-de-dee and tweedle-de-dum parties of Wall Street. The labor movement is beginning to understand more than ever before the need of an independent political party of labor.

The policies of the reactionary trade union leaders, with their Red-baiting campaign against the Communists for their removal from office and expulsion from the unions, inevitably weakens the unions. The Communists are loyal builders of the unions and know that the trade unions will be weak as long as they depend upon either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, that labor will be stronger as it builds strong fighting unions and an independent political party, whose main base should be the trade unions. Browder emphasizes this need in his book *The Way Out*. He says:

"For the working classes and toiling masses, therefore, the future is one of intensifying struggle to keep out of war, and to bring the war to an end; of even broader and more serious battles to defeat and throw back the attacks of monopoly capital against wages and living standards, against social legislation, against civil liberties and democratic rights for the masses. This struggle will inevitably force a general recognition among the working class and the toiling masses that the two old parties represent their enemy, Wall Street, monopoly capital, the economic royalists; that it is necessary to break completely with these parties, and achieve political independence through a Labor Party or Farmer-Labor Party."

One must not, however, be lulled to sleep by the growing strength of the progressive movement. That would be particularly dangerous at this time. As Roosevelt speeds America's entrance into the war we see the increasing boldness of the Hillmanites in their efforts to hitch labor to the imperialist war chariot. True, their boldness has increased not because they have made any great headway among the workers, but rather because of their fear of the growing militancy of the workers—and to the growing pressure upon them of their war-and-profit intent masters to "deliver the goods." Under these conditions the Hillmanites and their kind are resorting more and more to Red-baiting as one of their main weapons to confuse the workers.

It is important in this connection to remember that the Hillmanites gained a definite advantage—and they are now doing everything in their power to capitalize on it—in the resolution passed at the C.I.O. convention that lumped Nazism, Fascism and Communism together. It is a resolution that has no place

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in any convention of progressive trade unionists. No one at that convention, including the sponsors of the resolution, believed that Nazism, Fascism and Communism are the same, any more than Roosevelt does when he tries to include the Soviet Union among the totalitarian states. The Communists are known by their deeds as devoted builders of the trade unions, as the bitterest enemies of fascism. This "ism" resolution was the wedge needed by the Hillmanites and their reactionary masters. It was the only resolution passed at the C.I.O. convention that they really believed in.

The leadership of the C.I.O., if it ever hopes to preserve and strengthen the C.I.O. and to put into life the C.I.O. policy and program, and around them to unite the progressive leadership and membership of the A. F. of L., must meet Red-baiting as an enemy tactic being used by the enemies of the C.I.O. to destroy it and to shackle the workers to the no-strike, wage-cutting, wage-freezing, war program of the Roosevelt Administration.

The issue facing labor and the people is not the question of "the Reds." It was not and is not Browder versus the people. The issue is reaction or progress, war or peace. It was Roosevelt and reaction that put Browder in prison; it will be the working class and the progressive people that will set him free. Roosevelt and the reactionary war camp may lead America into the war—but it will be the people led by the working class that will end it. As Browder declares:

"We know that the American people will not forever and not long submit to this kind of system and this kind of leadership. Our own ruling class can launch us into this war but they cannot end it. The American people can end it; the American people will end it; and the American people will find the way to this all the quicker because the American people have produced already a Communist Party, a party with roots among the masses, a party that can never be separated from the American masses, a party that will always be at work amongst the American masses, a party that will organize and lead the American people to peace and to socialism." (*The Way Out*, p. 248.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROFESSOR LOGAN IS READY FOR A THIRD WORLD WAR!

BY HENRY WINSTON

A NEW "prophet" of Negro "liberation" has come upon the scene—Mr. Rayford Logan, Professor of History at Howard University. Where Walter White, T. Arnold Hill and A. Philip Randolph use the theory of the "lesser evil" to win the support of the Negro people for the present criminal imperialist war, Logan espouses, to the same end, the theory of the "white man's distress as the Negro's opportunity." Logan, indeed, has a very difficult assignment. Overzealous in proving his usefulness to the ruling class, he not only applauds the present conflict but, in anticipation, expresses his readiness to support a third imperialist war. To be sure, he does so in the name of self-determination for the colored peoples of the world. His position was thus expressed in his speech before the Negro teachers of the Alabama State Teachers Association, as reported in *The Afro-American* on March 29:

"I am no warmonger, but if self-determination for colored peoples necessitates a third world war, I say let it come by all means, so that the millions of colored peoples scattered all over the globe will be able to walk in dignity wherever they choose."

Logan, it appears, has a very guilty conscience, for in a shamefaced way he hastens to state that he is no warmonger. Yet, in the cited speech, comparing the plight of the Negro people during peacetime and wartime, he states:

"The highest economic position for the colored group in the country was reached during the last war."

And further:

". . . during peacetime thousands of our group have been buried, without having a chance to earn a decent day's wage, and in the event of a flood, or an earthquake, or an international war, our importance increases."

What is it that runs through these quotations other than the idea that the Negro people fare better under conditions of war than of peace? What other conclusion can one draw than that the Negro people must stake their future on world wars?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Negroes "Walk in Dignity" When War Comes

True, during the first World War there was a great influx of Negro workers into the industries of the North. There was tremendous industrial expansion at the time. Immigration was all off and the employers and the government turned to a new source of labor power—the dispossessed Negroes of the South.

Chas. H. Wesley, who interviewed many of the migrants, records in his book, *Negro Labor in the United States* (p. 292) the following varied answers:

"1. Low wages and depressing working conditions;
2. Lynchings and mob violence;
3. Jim-crow laws;
4. High mortgages and interest rates, no credit for Negro farmers;
5. Crop failures due to boll wevil and floods;
6. Lack of employment;
7. Discontent with southern segregated living areas;
8. Denial of justice before the courts, denial of right to vote;
9. Demand for labor in the North;
10. Unfair treatment of sharecroppers;
11. Activity of labor agents;
12. Desire to find new locations;
13. Attraction to North through letters from friends in North."

What is evident here is the desire of the Negro migrants to escape economic, political and social oppression. It is true that the wages of these Negro workers as contrasted with those in the South were increased. However, the migrants had to face many difficulties, including exorbitant rents and high prices. Whatever advances were made were not of a permanent nature. And while it is necessary to see this side of the picture it would be the height of folly to fail to see that the basic social, political and economic problems of the Negro people remained unsolved.

The black men lynched while wearing the uniform of the United States Army during the first world war offer tragic evidence against Logan's position. The use of the military machine to deepen the entire system of Jim-Crow use of Negro soldiers as labor battalions and shock troops refutes his optimistic visions.

Logan conveniently fails to see that the improvements in the "economic position of the colored people" during the first world war occurred under conditions unlike the present, at a time when American imperialism was in a period of ascendency. But need it be repeated today that the present industrial expansion is taking place largely at the expense of curtailing the "normal" industrial production? If during the first world war there was a shortage of labor, during the present war there exists a surplus of labor.

Thus, the A. F. of L. Research Service, in the February, 1941, issue of *The American Federationist* states:

"There were some 8,000,000 persons unemployed at the end of 1940. If the Army takes nearly one million and private industry two or two and a half million persons dur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing 1941, the unemployment would be reduced to four and a half or five million if no new workers came into the labor market."

And further:

". . . if we may anticipate at least half a million normal increase and perhaps a million abnormal increase in workers looking for jobs, adding these to the unemployed, we may have six or six and a half million job hunters still unemployed at the end of 1941."

Where expansion is taking place, it is not resulting in increased employment of Negro workers. Thus, the Negro people have to wage a struggle for jobs as part of their fight for economic and social equality—as part of their struggle against the war in alliance with all progressives and anti-imperialist forces. Look at the following facts: Vultee Aircraft, whose profits have skyrocketed as a result of war orders, has expressed the policy of discrimination most brazenly. Gerald Tuttle, industrial relations manager of Vultee Aircraft, sent the following reply to the Executive Secretary of the Los Angeles National Negro Congress:

"I regret to say that it is not the policy of this company to employ people other than those of the Caucasian race. Consequently, we are not in a position to offer your people employment at this time." (*Jim Crowism in Industry.* Pamphlet, published by the National Negro Congress, Los Angeles Council.)

The Glenn L. Martin Company, with $322,000,000 in government contracts, with 18,000 employed and 20,000 to be hired soon, has stated: "No Negroes will be employed." Charles W. Bingham Jr., a mechanical engineer from Pratt Institute and a graduate of the Civil Aeronautics training course at Floyd Bennett Field, was told, although his health was excellent, that he was "physically disqualified" when he applied for a job with the Wright Aeronautical Company and with the War Department. (*Labor Notes*, Labor Research Ass'n, April, 1941.)

In Fact for June 2, 1941, reports:

". . . on applications for registration of the Curtiss-Wright Technical Institute, Glendale, California, appears this statement: 'The Management reserves the right to refuse entrance to any one not acceptable. Applications by persons of the Negro race will not be accepted.' (Forms received from Sherwin, Chase, Chicago, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology Students.)"

Imperialist war is chauvinism at its worst, and the Negro people are the first victims of chauvinist policy. Rather than lessening discrimination, the present war drive by the United States has given governmental sanction to the policy of discrimination and has increased all the disabilities which affect the Negro under "normal" conditions. It is exactly this type of "importance," Mr. Logan, that the Negro people are fighting against.

Imperialist "Self-Determination"

Logan plays upon the deep-felt sympathy of the American Negroes for the oppressed peoples in the colonies and semi-colonies by demagogically holding out the prospect

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of self-determination as an element in the present war. He attempts to do two things at once, namely, to mobilize support for the imperialist war, at the same time professing support for the right of self-determination. He betrays thereby a complete lack of understanding of the character of the present war and falls into a position which is hopelessly contradictory. Is it not clear that imperialist war means plunder, subjugation and exploitation of peoples—while self-determination means the defeat of the imperialist oppressors and a fight against imperialist war? It may be necessary for the oppressed peoples to wage a war for self-determination, for liberation, but such a war will not be waged or led by the imperialist bourgeoisie; such a war would be anti-imperialist, a war directed against imperialist oppression. Can Logan, by any stretch of the imagination, maintain that the present war is being waged by England, Germany, or Japan for the self-determination of the oppressed peoples?

How did the present war arise? As far back as 1936, in an interview with Roy Howard, Comrade Stalin laid bare the fundamental basis for an understanding of the present war.

"*Howard*—What situation or condition, in your opinion, furnishes the chief war menace today?
Stalin—Capitalism.
Howard—In which specific manifestation of capitalism?
Stalin—Its imperialist, usurpatory manifestation. You remember how the first World War arose. It arose out of the desire to redivide the world. Today we have the same background." *

Clear, one would think—to every genuine fighter for self-determination! The present war is widening, drawing into its orbit ever larger numbers of peoples and states. The bourgeoisie of all the imperialist countries is responsible for this slaughter, is waging this war for imperialist aims—for colonies, for sources of raw materials, for domination of sea routes, for the subjugation and exploitation of peoples. When Logan supports the present war, it is this imperialism and not self-determination that he furthers. German imperialism, which was deprived of its colonies after the first imperialist world war, is now demanding a redivision of the colonial booty. Great Britain has no intention of letting her huge possessions slip out of her hands; nor has it any intention of giving independence to any of the subjugated territories it may succeed in wresting from the Axis powers. The British war lords wish to hold sole domination over the hundreds of millions of their colonial slaves, to insure the possibilities of new conquests, to enfeeble their rivals. This is the essence of the present conflict. That is why the Negro people are opposed to this war and join with all the peace-desiring masses in America in the demand that the United States get out and stay out of the war.

"One Dark Race, the Japanese . . ."

Logan presents Japanese impe-

* *The Stalin-Howard Interview*, International Publishers, p. 6.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rialism to the colored peoples of the world as a model, as being the friend of the darker peoples. This is not original with him. It is well known that, under conditions of "peace," the Pan Pacific movement propagated this idea. Under those circumstances, the objective of this slogan was to split the peace movement, to direct the thinking of the Negro masses into reactionary channels, which could not but aid the forces driving toward war.

But if, in the past, the idea of supporting Japanese imperialism was designed to put a brake on the peace movement, today it is brought forward as a means for furthering full participation in the second imperialist war. In Logan's words:

"For over 500 years the White World has been trampling under its feet yellow coolies, red peons and black slaves."

And he therefore concludes:

"For the first time in history, during the first world war, one dark race, the Japanese, found opportunity for equality, and if Mahatma Gandhi has the intelligence that he is supposed to have the 350,000,000 Indians will achieve their fight for self-determination in the present conflict."

What confusion, if not downright deception!

It is true that "yellow coolies, red peons and black slaves" have been trampled underfoot for centuries. But what about white Ireland, Mr. Logan, which has been struggling for its freedom from England for over seven hundred years? Is it not equally correct to state that the overwhelming majority of the white toilers have been trampled underfoot for centuries? But by whom have they been oppressed? Has it not been by the imperialists of Britain, Germany, France, Japan and the United States—in short, by the imperialists of all countries? Clear, one would think. But Logan, conveniently, makes no distinction between the white toilers and the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Is it not clear that not the white toilers but the imperialist bourgeois are the owners of the monopolies and trusts and the banks, the railroads, the factories, mines, mills, ships, tanks, guns? Is it not clear from this that the white toilers are not oppressors but are themselves oppressed? When Logan lumps together the white toilers and the imperialist bourgeoisie, he hereby helps to maintain imperialist oppression of the "yellow coolies, red peons and black slaves," as well as the white toilers. He shifts the burden of the blame from the oppressors to the oppressed in the so-called mother countries, shielding the real enemies of the oppressed peoples by failing to identify them to the masses. The effect of this, if successful, would be to sunder the natural alliance of the laboring people in the metropolitan countries with the colonial people, an alliance without which neither could hope to achieve its liberation. How then can Logan speak of national liberation and support of the present war?

Logan travels from one absurdity to another. He hails the last world war because "one dark race, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese, found an opportunity for equality," and concludes that, out of this war, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, the "350,000,000 Indians will achieve their fight for self-determination." Will the people of India achieve self-determination by currying favor with their imperialist oppressors, by supporting them in the present war? Or will they gain self-determination by fighting their oppressors? Which is the way to liberty for the Indians, Mr. Logan? The way to liberty for the Indian people is the way of struggle against all imperialism, and in the first place against their direct oppressors—British imperialism.

He is delighted that the Japanese "found an opportunity for equality" during the last war. What type of equality is this which he applauds? What has been its meaning for the people of Japan and China?

Japanese imperialism displaced Germany in the important seaboard province of China, Shantung, and imposed its infamous Twenty-One Demands. It thus, for the first time, gained a firm foothold in China, alongside of its imperialist allies-rivals. It staked out its claim to an equal, if not dominant, share in plundering and oppressing "one dark race," the Chinese people.

Japanese imperialism emerged from the last world war in a much improved position, as one of the major imperialist states. The significance of this was that Japanese imperialism had entered into the world arena of imperialist struggle for colonial subjugation. This could not but lead to sharpened imperialist antagonisms, to economic and military rivalry for control of the Pacific.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume, as Logan does, that Japan's development into an imperialist power "just happened" as a result of the first world war. As early as the end of the nineteenth century, the expansionist policy of the ruling circles of Japan had manifested itself. Witness, for example, the Sino-Japanese war, the Russo-Japanese war, the struggle in 1904-5 over Korea. Japan's participation then in the First World War was but an extension of the expansionist policy of the Japanese war lords. The seizure of North China and Manchuria, and now the struggle to conquer the whole of China, is a continuation of Japanese imperialist struggle for the subjugation and exploitation of the Chinese people and the mastery of the Pacific.

Thus, the equality which Mr. Logan speaks of is "parity" among robbers, among fellow imperialist states—which leads to war and intensified oppression of the colonial peoples. Could there be a better illustration of this fact than the ravaging of China today by Japanese imperialism?

And Logan rejoices at this "opportunity for equality" for Japanese imperialism!

But this "equality" does not merely signify the waging by Japan of an imperialist plunder war abroad—it also signifies a most intense system of internal repression of the Japanese toilers. The imperialist war against China is straining the country to the breaking

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point. The economic resources of the country are at a very low ebb. The decline of industrial production, which began in 1938, continues apace. The constant reduction of wages, increased taxation, the constant rise in prices for consumer goods intensify the economic oppression of the Japanese workers.

Half of the home market consists of poverty-stricken peasants. The middle classes and professionals have been forced into a pauper-like existence. The rationing of sugar, charcoal and matches has now been extended to the chief food staple of the masses, rice.

In an attempt to whip up a chauvinistic spirit among the masses for the war the Japanese Home Ministry instituted a "National Spiritual Mobilization" campaign. Unable, however, to win support among the masses for the war and to put a halt to the rising anger of the workers and peasants, the Japanese Diet outlawed all political parties. Under the supervision of the Home Ministry the police carried through hundreds of raids, arresting not only militant workers and peasants but liberals and pacifists. This was followed by a "National Mobilization Bill," which called for compulsory allocation of workers to jobs; prohibited strikes; and fixed wages, hours and working conditions by government decree.

All of these measures proved inadequate, however. In 1940 the Home Ministry organized a National Spy system, the so-called "Near Neighbor" groups, the aim of which is to spy upon the activities of the workers and peasants.

Thus, the war conducted by this "model" of Mr. Logan has brought about intensified economic and social oppression of its own toilers. This is the meaning of the "equality" of "One dark race, the Japanese . . ." which Logan hails and holds up for admiration to the colored people of the world. But the Negro people, Mr. Logan, together with the Chinese people, with the Japanese working class, and with the white toilers of the world, can see this "model" Japanese imperialism only as representative of all oppressive, peace-destroying imperialist states.

Logan, to be sure, proclaims that he is for self-determination. But the question is: how is self-determination to be achieved? Logan places this entire question on a "racial" basis, instead of on a national liberation, anti-imperialist basis. But even so, why does he support Japanese imperialism as opposed to the Chinese people? Here he has a very clear choice between two "dark races." He could support the Chinese toilers in their heroic struggle for national salvation from Japanese and world imperialism; or he could support Japanese imperialism. His choice is Japanese imperialism.

Why is this so? It is because Logan is not interested in real self-determination. Self-determination with him becomes a means to cover up his support for imperialist war, and oppression of the Chinese and Japanese toilers. As against the Logans, we take our stand on the side of the Chinese people, and of the oppressed toilers of Japan.

Logan further states that "the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

350,000,000 Indians will achieve their liberation if Mahatma Gandhi has the intelligence he is supposed to have." Undoubtedly the Indian people will be victorious in their fight for self-determination, but this fight will not be decided by the "intelligence" of a Mahatma Gandhi Rather, it will be decided by the Indian masses under the leadership of the National Congress and the Communist Party. Such a struggle will be directed, not only against British imperialism but against the compromisers with, and capitulators to British imperialism within India. Just as the Negro people in the United States have their Logans, so the people in India have their Gandhis. Why is this so? Because the fight for self-determination of the Indian masses is a fight for national freedom, an anti-imperialist fight. The struggle of the Indian masses for self-determination is linked with that of the oppressed Chinese people, who are waging a just war against Japanese imperialism, which has been "appeased" and abetted by British and American imperialism. The Indian masses look more and more to the Soviet Union as the only country in the world which has liberated 200,000,000 people from imperialist war and oppression. Thus, the question that we are dealing with is not in any sense a racial one, but a question of the vast mass of humanity in motion against world imperialism.

Conclusion

Logan's "theory" is wrong because it identifies imperialism with the white people and does not make a distinction between the few white imperialists and the vast majority of white toilers who, like the majority of mankind, are victims of imperialist oppression. This on the one hand leads him to welcome and glorify Japanese imperialism. On the other hand, he overlooks the fact that the Negro people has allies in the other victims of imperialist oppression. Logan's counsel serves only the imperialist oppressors.

What is the correct position?

1. The Negro people must fight imperialism at all times and must intensify that struggle when imperialism is in a crisis.

2. This struggle must be waged in alliance with all the anti-imperialist forces, especially those forces which are inherently and consistently antagonists of imperialism—the working class and the Soviet Union.

3. The present imperialist war has brought and will increasingly bring greater hardships and sufferings to the oppressed masses, including the Negro people. Therefore, all the oppressed masses must wage a united fight against the imperialist war. At the same time, the war signifies an acute inter-imperialist struggle, an acute crisis of world imperialism. The oppressed must take advantage of this to fight for their interests and to weaken their imperialist enemy.

The plight of imperialism is the opportunity of the oppressed. The road of liberation of the Negro people is the road of struggle against imperialism, against capitalism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COLOMBIA FACES THE IMPERIALIST OFFENSIVE

BY AUGUSTO DORAN

General Secretary of the Communist Party of Colombia

THE consequences of the imperialist war have not been any the less harmful for Colombia than for any other Latin American country. In the case of Colombia, however, the situation is aggravated by United States control of our export trade, as a result of the British blockade. Ninety-three per cent of Colombian exports (coffee, oil and bananas) are today under this control, which is the reason that, since the outbreak of the war, the country has fallen into an even greater degree of dependency on the "good neighbor" to the North.

This obviously has a profound effect on the foreign trade balance, inasmuch as Yankee imperialism, while buying Colombian exports at the lowest possible price, sells at the highest possible price those goods which are imported into the country. The Colombian economic situation accordingly deserves careful analysis, with first of all the factor of commercial exchange taken into account.

In the years 1939-40 the deficit in the trade balance was a large one. Seventy million, six hundred thousand pesos, in all. Commenting on this, the government organ, *El Tiempo*, says:

"*The cause of these trade deficits is to be found, not alone in the increased volume of imports, but, on the one hand, in the greater buying of consumer goods and the general rise in prices abroad, and, on the other hand, in the drop in price of coffee, bananas, leather and tobacco, along with the decrease in the amounts exported of the three last-named articles.*"

It must be pointed out that, although the first results of the coffee quota pact are favorable, upon the completion of the first year's quota in the coming month, overproduction will begin to tell, and prices are bound to drop considerably, rendering the situation still worse. Bananas have already dropped from 50 to 32 1/2 cents the bunch, and oil from $12.60 to $11.50 the ton.

The differential in the trade balance is being covered with gold exports, a circumstance which, even though Colombia is a gold-producing country, cannot fail to affect the national economy.

The government thinks it is going to solve its acute economic problems by having recourse to loans made in the United States. But loans are not an easy thing to obtain, in spite of all the talk of "economic cooperation" that was heard from Mr. Cordell Hull at the diplomats'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conference in Havana. One has but to glance at the situation in which this country finds itself at the present time with respect to the North American market. Or rather: it is easy enough to obtain loans, provided certain conditions are met. The first time it was approached by President Santos for a loan, the United States government laid down as its first condition the renewal of payments on the foreign debt, which would mean a minimum annual disbursement of 15,000,000 pesos, and which could only result in a deepening of the economic and financial crisis.

The other conditions for loans laid down by Mr. Roosevelt are not known to the public; but it is an open secret that, owing to our proximity to the Panama Canal, and our ports upon both the Atlantic and the Pacific, the Roosevelt of today, relative of the Roosevelt who, back in 1903, dismembered the state of the same name, has an interest in naval and territorial bases in Colombia, for the defense of the Canal. And it is certain that there will be no loans for Colombia, unless concessions are made to Yankee imperialism; concessions, such as those of bases, which would be injurious to the national sovereignty; and, what would be more injurious still, the construction or conditioning of those bases to suit the needs of North American fleets, out of the national treasury!

In support of our argument, we herewith transcribe a United Press dispatch to the Colombian papers, following the return of Ambassador Turbay to Washington; it has reference to the ambassador's efforts to secure a loan of $40,000,000:

"It is believed that attention will be devoted, preferably, to the development of deep-water ports on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts; the use of such ports, as Ambassador Turbay recently stated, will be the subject of discussion in all the American nations, in the interest of continental solidarity, when the opportune moment arrives."

It is a sign of the times that, along with the talk of loans, the imperialist-serving press has redoubled its campaign of chauvinism, making a great to-do about the dangers of a European invasion. President Santos' brother, Caliban, who was recently entertained in the United States, where he went to receive the Cabot award, is more imperialist than the imperialists themselves, and exceeds the bounds of decency when he says, in one of his latest published statements on this subject:

"The heads of the United States government see all this clearly enough. Meanwhile, precious time is being lost."

What Señor Caliban means to say is that precious time is being lost in declaring a state of war for the country, and in repressing the anti-imperialist movement. For while it is certain that the military high command of the United States is not interested in raising an expeditionary force of Colombian soldiers, fever-ridden and inexperienced in modern mechanized warfare, nevertheless, by the declaration of a state of war in fulfilment of the obligations undertaken by the Latin American governments at Havana, democratic liberties would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be liquidated and the plunder and enslavement of the Colombian people would be facilitated.

Colombian reactionaries and sellers-out of their country of the Caliban type are especially anxious to have the United States enter the war before the convening of the next legislative chamber, in order that they may not only have the opportunity to dictate statutes outlawing the Communist Party under pretext of its internationalist character, but may be able more successfully to exert pressure against the *"Lopistas"* and thereby avoid the possible proclamation of Alfonso Lopez as president at the next National Liberal Convention.

The imperialist war, meanwhile, is becoming a flesh-and-blood reality for the Colombian people, and the full meaning of it is dawning upon them: through wage-cuts, mass firings and the lengthening of the working day, to which both native and foreign employers resort in an effort to unload the burden of the crisis on the backs of the workers. The minister of finance has announced a cut in the national budget of 6,000,000 pesos. Payment of their last year's annual bonus has been refused to more than 10,000 railway workers. In the banana country, controlled by the United Fruit Company, hundreds of workers are trudging from one farmhouse to another in a vain search for work.

The workers, however, are beginning to react to this state of affairs. A strike of 1,000 brewery employees, for higher wages, in the B. Avaria factories, met with some success. The Rio Magdalena workers have responded militantly every time an attempt was made to ignore the agreement signed with the shipping companies.

On May 1 last, great popular demonstrations were held in all the principal cities of the country, led by the banners of the Confederation of Colombian Workers (C.T.C.), with slogans calling for *The Unity of Workers and the People*, for the defense of the national economy, for neutrality in the robber war, and for better living conditions for the toiling masses. Many trade unionists inscribed upon their streamers slogans calling for the freedom of Earl Browder and Luis Carlos Prestes, this First of May. in Bogota a Communist Party speaker, Comrade Juan Manuel Valdelamar, leader of the river and marine workers, made a long speech in which he outlined the peace policy of the Soviet Union. He was greeted with warm applause and cries of *"Viva la U.R.S.S.* [U.S.S.R.]," on the part of those participating in the demonstration.

In struggling for the freedom of Browder and Prestes and the defense of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, Colombian workers have registered an advance in the spirit of proletarian internationalism; they have shown that they understand what our great Comrade Stalin means when he says: "The national question is a part of the general question of the proletarian revolution. . . ."

It is under such conditions as these that the question of the presidential succession is being raised in our country at the present moment. The appearance of Ex-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Alfonso Lopez, one of the leaders of the government party, as a candidate, with a program which sets the question of the industrialization of the country and the defense of the national economy over against the colonizing ambitions of the Yankee magnates, has led to a widespread movement in the candidate's favor, one in which the trade unions are nearly everywhere taking the lead. It is only natural to suppose that such a program would meet with the liveliest resistance on the part of the land-holding oligarchy and the great commercial importers within the country and the North American imperialists on the outside. These forces, with the powerful means of propaganda which they have at their disposal, are bringing a terrific pressure to bear upon the government, in order to force it to place the state power at the service of the opposition to Lopez; they have partly succeeded.

It is to be noted that, in the first skirmishes between the opposing forces, at the last election for deputies and representatives, the democratic masses won their initial victory, by gaining a majority over those Liberal candidates who are opposed to the ideas and program of Señor Lopez.

The reactionaries, on the other hand, are not asleep, and are waiting to strike at the opportune moment. Following its defeat at the polls, the Conservative-Liberal coalition, consisting of the Catholic Clerical Party and the extreme Liberal Right, replied with the assassination of outstanding *"Lopista"* leaders in the Department of El Valle; and as a result, Alfonso Lopez himself has wavered somewhat in his anti-imperialist position. But if Señor Lopez wavers, the people of El Valle have responded to this criminal offensive on the part of the reactionary coalitionists with huge demonstrations of protest and a twenty-four-hour strike on the Pacific Railway, the largest in the country, thus giving their leaders to understand that they refuse to share their complicity by keeping silent in the face of such events.

The Communist Party has launched a slogan of struggle for the calling of a *National People's Convention,* representing the trade unions and trade union federations, the rural leagues, the students and progressive youth, the liberal committees and the Communist Party, in order to agree upon a program of anti-imperialist and anti-reactionary action, such a program as shall give voice to the most obvious national aspirations of the Colombian people. This convention should at the same time agree upon a candidate for the presidency of the Republic, since it is a foregone conclusion that the National Liberal Convention, which meets in July, will not be able to do so.

It is under this slogan that the Party is now being mobilized; an intensive agitation will be carried out in the trade unions and among the masses of the people, as the one way out of the situation that has been created, and by way of lending impulse to the movement for popular betterment, for the defense of the national economy, for neutrality, and for a free and prosperous Colombia.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN UNITED STATES AGRICULTURE *

BY ERIK BERT

"The foremost country of modern capitalism is particularly interesting for the study of the social-economic structure and evolution of modern agriculture. The United States is unequaled in rapidity of development of capitalism at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, in the high level of development already attained, in the vastness of its territory—on which is employed the most up-to-date technical equipment suitable for the remarkable variety of natural and historical conditions—and in the degree of political freedom and the cultural level of the masses of the people. Indeed, this country is in many respects the model and ideal of our bourgeois civilization." (Lenin [1914-1915], "Theory of the Agrarian Question," Volume XII of the *Selected Works,* International Publishers, New York, p. 190.)

". . . in all arguments on the subject of the evolution of agriculture and its laws the discussion centers precisely on the question of small and large-scale *production.*" *(Ibid.,* p. 242.)

Recent Development of Technique in Agriculture

THERE has been a profound development of technique in agriculture during the past generation, including changes in machines, animals, plants and land use.

Two outstanding examples of the raising of the technical level of agriculture are the development of hybrid corn (especially during the past eight years) and the increased use of tractors and tractor powered equipment (especially during the past twenty years).

The profound character of some of the changes in technique are evident in: the change to hybrid corn to the point where 75 per cent of the Iowa corn acreage (and 25 per cent of the national acreage) was planted to hybrid corn in 1939, in contrast to practically nothing in 1933; and in the doubling of the tractors in use between 1930 and 1940.

On the basis of present conditions in agriculture it is estimated that in the next ten years there will be a doubling of hybrid corn acreage, and an increase of between 30 and

* The present article is a partial summary and analysis of "Theory of the Agrarian Question" by V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol. XII; "Why Farmers Are Poor" by Anna Rochester; and "Technology on the Farm" by U. S. Department of Agriculture. Unless otherwise credited all factual material is from Anna Rochester's extremely valuable analysis of American agriculture.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

50 per cent in the number of tractors. The tendency of such developments will be to aggravate sharply all the existing contradictions in American agriculture.

The advance of technique has resulted in an appreciable reduction in the man-hours required per unit of product.

The degree to which tractor farming affects agriculture is seen in the fact that while "in 1929, tractor farms were barely one-seventh (13.5 per cent) of all farms in the country . . . they were producing more than half of the commercial output" (51 per cent). At the other extreme were the remaining six-sevenths (86.5 per cent) which produced less than half (49 per cent) of the commercial output.

The doubling of the number of tractors in use since 1929 has made mechanized equipment an even more potent factor in agriculture.

Technical Advance and Capital Investment

The advance in technique necessitates an increase in the amount of capital invested, and establishes as a prerequisite for successful operation a larger investment per farm than was necessary previously.

The advance in technique necessitates not only an increase in the total amount of capital invested per farm, but establishes as a prerequisite for successful operation a larger working capital than was previously necessary. Thus, the advance in technique is accompanied by a qualitative change in agriculture, resulting in increased commercialization of the farm enterprise.

Lenin points out that "under the tenant farmer system the stimulus to improvements, etc., becomes weaker." (*Ibid.*, p. 38.) The development of capitalism has depressed this stimulus even among middle farmer owner-operators, who sacrifice permanent farm improvements for those investments which can be translated into reduced production costs in a relatively shorter period of time. Comparing the years 1936-37 with the pre-crisis years of the 1920's we find that middle farmers spent more for farm machinery in the latter period, less for fertilizer, and "very much less than formerly for farm improvements." "This means a declining trend in general upkeep of the middle farmers' land and buildings." (Rochester, pp. 197-198.) In the effort to cut production costs through raising the technique of agriculture, primarily through increased use of machinery, expenditures of a more permanent character are sacrificed.

Tenancy and Mortgage

". . . mortgage and usury are, so to speak, forms in which capital overcame the obstacles which private property in land creates for the free penetration of capital into agriculture." (Lenin, p. 325.) ". . . the process of the land becoming separated from the farmer is expressed in two forms: in the tenant farmer system, and in mortgage debts." (Lenin, p. 10.)

While in England, where the landlord-tenant farmer system developed early,

". . . the separation of land ownership from land cultivation is obvious" . . . "in all other capitalist countries . . . *the same process* of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the separation of land ownership from land cultivation is taking place, although in extremely varied forms (leases, mortgages)." (Lenin, p. 66.)

The degree to which capital has infiltrated into agriculture through tenancy and mortgages is concisely stated in the report of (then) Secretary of Agriculture Wallace for 1938, (quoted by Rochester, p. 130):

"Farm land rented in 1938 constituted more than 45% of all the farm land in the country as compared with only 31% in 1900. Tenants, including croppers, operated 42% of all the farms in 1935, as compared with 25% in 1880. . . . Rent paid by farmers in the United States to non-farmers in 1935 is estimated at $699,000,000 . . . and in 1937 at $829,000,000.

"Mortgage debt constitutes an increasing proportion of the value of farm real estate. . . . The debt load has about doubled during the last quarter of a century. In 1880 the equity of farm operators in farm real estate in the United States as a whole was about 62% of the value of all farm real estate. By 1930 the proportion had fallen to 41%, and by 1935 to 39%."

Alienation of the farmer from the land, either directly in the form of tenancy or indirectly in the form of mortgages, is one of the outstanding features of the evolution of agriculture in the United States in the era of imperialism and increasing domination of finance capital. This has as its corollary the increasing toll taken by finance capital. "Payments for rent, mortgage interest, taxes and bank credit" amounted in 1929 to more than $2,000,000,000. (Rochester, p. 79.)

One consequence of the complete expropriation of the farmer is that the mortgage holder-borrower relationship of finance capital and the farmer is superseded by the landlord-tenant relationship. This involves certain new problems for finance capital in caring for its property, closer supervision, and an apparatus of supervisors of one kind or another.

An alternative consequence of expropriation is for the process of foreclosure-eviction to be followed by resale of the property to some other farmer, to begin again the familiar mortgage holder-borrower relationship between finance capital and the farmer on this property. Special factors of a sectional character, and types of agriculture, are important in determining which of the two methods are used in separating the farmer from his land.

Large-Scale vs. Small-Scale Production

The data on farm income in the United States give a striking reflection of the social and economic stratification on the countryside. On the basis of net income from all sources, including relief, we have the following distribution of farm families, in 1935-1936 (National Resources Committee, quoted by Rochester, p. 12):

3,825,800 farm families, or 56% of all, had less than $1,000;
1,393,600 farm families, or 21% of all, had from $1,000 to $1,500;
1,073,000 farm families, or 16% of all, had from $1,500 to $2,500;
474,800 farm families, or 7% of all, had over $2,500;
Less than 25,000, or about 4 farm

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

families in every 1,000, had $10,000 or over.

In 1929 (the latest date for which figures are available) 900,000 farm families, or one out of seven, had less than $400 *gross* farm income.

Comparison of farms and farm products sold (for 1929) shows that the development of capitalism in agriculture has induced a definite polarization. Specifically: more than one-quarter of all farms (28.0%) produced about one thirtieth (3.4%) of all farm products sold; more than four-fifths of all farms (80.8%) produced less than two-fifths (38.5%) of all farm products sold. At the other end, less than one twenty-fifth (3.9%) of all farms produced more than one-fourth (28.3%) of all farm products sold; and less than one-fifth of all farms (19.2%) produced more than three-fifths (61.5%) of all farm products sold. If we contrast the situation in 1929 with that obtaining in 1899 we find: a marked increase in the proportion of total farm product coming from the largest farms; a decrease in the proportion coming from the poorest and smallest farms; and a corresponding decline in relative importance of smaller farms of all sizes.

"The main line of development of capitalist agriculture—which is gradually becoming the main line of development even in America" is "the process of concentration of production in large farms" and the elimination of "small production." (Lenin, p. 282.)

Approximately one-third of the farms are large enough from an economic point of view to use motor equipment competitively—two-thirds of the farms cannot use such equipment competitively.

The further use of tractors and tractor-equipment will be confined by and large to one-third of the farms. Two-thirds of the farms will continue without tractor equipment and in competition with an increased concentration of motor equipment on the other third.

Characteristic of agriculture under capitalism is the existence of millions of economically small farms.

"The less productive half of the farms reported in the census in 1930 contributed only 11 per cent of the value of farm products entering commercial channels in 1929." (*Technology on the Farm*, p. 68.)

Displacement of Labor, and Expropriation

"The effects of technological and related developments upon commercialization in agriculture . . . will tend to bring about a more commercial agriculture, and . . . despite the larger acreage in commercial production, fewer farmers will be engaged in production of marketable products." (*Ibid.*, p. 69.)

Wage labor on the countryside means, not only that the capitalist farmers, especially the richest farmers, employ workers, but also that the poorest farmers are deprived of their petty-bourgeois "independence" and become when possible either part-time or full-time wage workers. In 1929 and 1934 there were about two million farmers who were so badly off that they had to work off their farms. In 1934, at least three out of four of these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

farmers were doing non-agricultural work. Further, in 1934 some 465,000 members of farm families living at home and included in the farm population brought in earnings from non-farm occupations. Further evidence of the proletarianization of the poorest sections of the farm population exists in the fact that about "three and a half million rural households, more than one out of four of the families on farms and in villages, received assistance from a public or private agency at some time during the years from 1930 to 1937 . . . [by] a conservative estimate." (Rochester, p. 11.)

The technical level achieved at the present time and the amount of capital required to operate at this level exclude a large section of farmers from even a fighting chance of surviving as "independent" commercial producers.

The recent development of capitalism in agriculture is reflected in an increase in non-commercial, subsistence, part-time farming. This development takes place against an existing background of widespread subsistence and non-commercial farming. The economic forces which today drive toward increased capital investment in agriculture, increased mechanization, raising the technical level of agriculture, drive untold millions also toward a farm-to-mouth existence, deprived of even the barest competitively necessary equipment, depressing and destroying the technical levels they had previously achieved.

"Although the general tendency is toward a more commercial agriculture, workers displaced by mechanization very often move toward the less commercialized areas. . . . Such a movement would mean that the agriculture of these areas will become even less commercialized than at present." (*Technology on the Farm*, p. 69.)

Economically small or minute farms of a subsistence character are a characteristic development.

"A large group, perhaps as many as one million farms, were [in 1930] far down the scale in degree of commercialization. Approximately one-half of these were farms classified as self-sufficing—that is, they were farms upon which the value of the produce used in the home exceeded the value of the produce contributed to commercial channels." (*Ibid.*, p. 68.)

The advance of technique in agriculture under capitalism has meant in the immediately past years the widespread uprooting and permanent displacement of tens of thousands of farm families. The perspective for the future is for more uprooting and wider displacement.

In certain types of agriculture, for example livestock breeding and dairying, the raising of technique and the increase in capital investment have not extended appreciably the area of operations, but have intensified operations primarily by applying more capital to the same acreage.

The tendency of other technical advances, particularly tractorization, is not only toward economically larger farm units, but toward larger land units: not alone to greater capital investment but to increased acreage as well. This is particularly the case in the cash corn and major wheat areas.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One process of "proletarianizing" the farmers, said Lenin, is "the growing divorcement of the peasantry from the land, the expropriation of the rural population." Under the sway of finance capital this becomes a mass phenomenon. In just ten years' time, from 1925 to 1935, about thirty farms out of every hundred, throughout the entire country, were put on the block through foreclosures and other forced sales.

The Joads of *The Grapes of Wrath* are today a national symbol of the dispossessed and migrant victims of capitalism in agriculture in the United States.

". . . The increasing migration, not only of the agricultural laborers but also of the peasants, from the country to the towns is in itself striking evidence of this growing proletarianization. But the peasant's flight to the cities is inevitably preceded by his ruin; and ruin is preceded by a desperate fight for economic independence." (Lenin, pp. 132-33.)

Lenin pointed also to the "obvious connection between the flight of the population from the rural districts and the ruin of the small producers" and to "the amount of privation, oppression and pauperization" that is reflected in this "flight." (*Ibid.*, p. 264.)

"Privation, oppression, pauperization" were the main factors in driving *annually* 1,940,000 men, women and children from the farms to the cities in the period between the two post-War crises, 1920 and 1929. A contrary movement of smaller proportions was the return to the land in these same years of some 1,300,000 persons *annually*, who attempted to find on the land the security that they could not find in the cities even in the heyday of post-War capitalism. Because of insecurity in either city or farm in the crisis years 1929 to 1933 the number leaving and returning to the country was about equal.

Temporarily, in 1935, the number of farmers was greater by half a million than it had been five years earlier. But these new farmers were in a most unstable position. And preliminary returns from the 1940 census show a new sharp decline in numbers of farms in every section of the country.

The perspective for the future, as a result of further raising of the technical level of agriculture, as well as from the "unspent" consequences of past technical changes, is that hundreds of thousands of additional families will be uprooted and permanently displaced. Estimates of 350,000 to 500,000 additional wage workers and farmers to be permanently displaced in the next decade indicate the enormity of the attack. These are in addition to the million and a half males of working age now on the farms who are totally or partially unemployed.

The significance of mechanization is not confined to the present results of past mechanization or to what can be estimated as to future mechanization. Of great importance are the results still to be expected from past mechanization. The full social consequences of raising the technical level to the present time have not yet been felt. The dynamic force of this advance is still "unspent."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance Capital

Industry and banking, trustified and monopolized under imperialism, finance capital, drive persistently to drain off all the benefits of technical progress from agriculture. The singleness of purpose and of organization that the farmers find in finance capital and its component parts stands in marked contrast to the millionfold atomization of the farmers. While finance capital tends to drain off the benefits of technical advance in general from agriculture, its specific consequences are quite varied. The advance of technique accentuates the economic differences within agriculture. While finance capital appropriates as much as possible from agriculture, the rich farmers at the same time increase their profits. The poorest and middle farmers who never benefited from the advance in technique are drained to extinction in the process of finance capital expropriating from agriculture what benefits flow from improved technique and increased capital investment.

Government Loans

Lenin analyzed the question of government loans, which have assumed such tremendous significance in the lives of the farmers of the United States. The Narodniki supported such advances in order to find an "out" to the question of the development of capitalism in agriculture. Lenin analyzed instead the "social-economic significance of all these 'cheap loans and grants.'"

". . . The state can only serve as an intermediary in transferring the money from the capitalists; but the state itself can obtain this money only from the capitalists. Consequently, even under the best possible organization of state aid the domination of capital is not removed in the least" and the "cheap loans and grants" by the capitalist state constitute just one of the "possible forms of application of capital to agriculture." (Lenin, p. 325.)

The shifting of mortgage holdings from private capitalist agencies to the federal government in the post-1929-30 period meant for the capitalist class an exchange of individually insecure and "frozen" equities in agriculture for equities (in the form of Land Bank bonds) secured by quasi-government guarantees and as liquid as the bond market, than which more could not be asked. The extraction of interest toll from the farmers was made a matter of state intervention. Interest rates were moderated from the inflated toll that could not be collected due to the crisis, to levels that could be extracted without facing the danger of having foreclosure and eviction struggles attain a higher pitch than in 1931-32.

The free and easy acceptance by the capitalists of the fact that private mortgage holdings and government mortgage holdings are basically of the same stuff is evident not only in the transfer to government holdings during the years of acute crisis but in recent tendencies to reverse the process, since that now appears to some of them to be more extractive.

The intervention of the state in agricultural financing has not been

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

limited to refinancing mortgages. Short-term loans of one kind or another were provided by one kind or another of farm "relief" measure during the years of sharpest farm crisis by the Roosevelt Administration. Such loans were allocated for the most part like any other bank loans—to the enterprises which provided the best guarantees for their repayment. In this way special sustenance was provided to the upper sections of the farm population.

Such special aid tended to strengthen this section of the farm population in contrast to, and against, the poorest sections. It constitutes, of course, a further infiltration of finance capital into agriculture, albeit under the "New Deal" and through government agencies. Such aid as was provided for the poorest farmers was designed not to strengthen them in the struggle for existence as competitors in the agricultural market, but to remove them from the competitive market to subsistence, non-commercial vegetation.

Rural Retrogression

The evolution of agriculture under capitalism cannot be evaluated properly unless the conditions of life of the small and poor farmers and their methods of production become a proper part of the survey. Exhaustion of family, soil and animals, and deterioration of tools characterize the lot of the small farmer. Housing is worse, undernourishment greater, disease more widespread, medical aid less, educational opportunities fewer, in the rural areas than in the cities, in a nation where at least one third are "ill-housed, ill-clothed and ill-nourished." Exhaustion of the soil, like exhaustion of the farm family, marks the trail of capitalism in agriculture.

Ruination of our natural resources is one of the normal consequences of the capitalist development of agriculture.

Capitalism devastates not only the land but the people as well. Poverty and degradation are the lot of millions of the toiling population on the land. A vast supply of unused labor power is testimony of the failure of capitalism to organize the labor of the people to fill their needs. Instead, wasted labor power, wasted land and privation are a chronic consequence of the development of capitalism in agriculture.

Agriculture in the South

In reviewing the agriculture of the South, Lenin declared that "The farmers we are discussing are not tenants in the European, civilized, modern capitalist sense; they are mainly semi-feudal or—what is the same in the economic sense—semi-slave *share tenants*." (Lenin, p. 199.) The present situation in the South can be summarized, in Rochester's words, as follows:

"More farmers are poor in the South than elsewhere. . . . Negro farmers, most of whom are in the South, are the poorest of all. . . . Sharecropping has remained the peculiarly characteristic form of labor exploitation in Southern agriculture. . . . Semi-feudal plantation farming has grown and persisted as the dominant form of operation in cotton farming throughout the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old South. . . . At the same time, a great mass of small poor farmers are also operating outside of the sharecropping system. . . ."

"Plantation farming is quite definitely a form of large-scale operation" and has been penetrated by finance capital, through mortgages and also complete expropriation. "Plantations based on sharecropping and share tenancy have retarded the development of large cotton farms on a completely capitalist basis."

The incursion of tractors into Southern agriculture recently shows that the technical basis for agriculture there is changing. Motorized equipment produces cotton (aside from picking) at costs 60 per cent less than those of the unequipped sharecropper.

Summary figures for the South obscure the marked difference between the dominant old South and certain special areas.

The backwardness of agriculture in the old South under the semi-feudal plantation system has retarded technical progress in that territory, particularly with regard to mechanized equipment. The competitive advantages of tractorization have been less marked there, where the brutal degradation of the living standards of the sharecroppers has served to offset the competitive advantages of the tractor. The tractor's advance has been retarded, for one thing, by the degradation of the living standards of the people.

In contrast to the general retardation of technical progress in the South we find that certain areas (western Texas, Oklahoma, the deltas of Arkansas and Mississippi) are marked by *a more rapid tractorization than in any other group of states in the entire country.*

What a capitalist future holds in store for the people of the South is evident in the estimate of experts that 300,000 additional families will be displaced during the next ten years, an average of 30,000 per year, as a result of the advance of technique. The development of the cotton picker in a form which can effectively underbid even the miserable conditions of the sharecroppers and Southern wage workers will aggravate still more the process of uprooting and displacement.

The combined exploitation of imperialism and a semi-feudal system are evident in the inability of the South, today, to provide for an adequate diet of the farm population, in terms of crops sown.

In contrast to other parts of the country the displacement of labor in the South is accompanied by a relative increase in the amount of hired, wage, labor. The tenure of the sharecroppers is much less secure than the tenure of either tenants or owner-operators in the other parts of the nation. Outside the South, for the most part (excluding the corporation farms) the operating unit is still the individual "family" farm (ranging from the wealthiest farmers to the poorest). In the South the economic operating unit has been the plantation composed of cropper patches. The individual cropper's patch has been a part, like that of his neighbors, of the plantation as the main economic unit. In the rest of the nation private property in land has existed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the form of the individual, "independent," farm.

This has formed the basis for tenure rights. The existence of these traditional rights strengthens the fight to maintain the independent farm which gave rise to these rights. Witness the bitter struggle in the crisis years of 1931, 1932 and 1933 against eviction of individual tenants and owner-operators. On the other hand, the virtual extinction of democratic rights in the South for hundreds of thousands of the poorest farmers, in the semi-feudal plantation economy, serves to perpetuate the rights of the plantation owners against the croppers.

The major significance in the change from sharecropper to wage laborer status lies in the fact that it deprives the farmer of even the last vestiges of any security based on land tenure. This process is being pressed even where it does not result, as yet, in the complete substitution of wage labor. In such cases it proceeds to the point where the sharecropper's patch is merged into the plantation and where his garden disappears in a sea of cotton.

Ideological Change

The development of capitalism in agriculture has blocked the road to individual advancement of the "independent" farmer, or tenant, or farm worker, as far as the overwhelming majority of the farm population is concerned. A qualitatively different and more recent development is the realization among large sections of the farm population that as things are at present constituted there is no individual salvation for them. It is primarily a negative development—loss of confidence in the traditions of American agriculture under capitalism; rather than the development of a positive realization of a different kind of salvation—not under capitalism.

"During the recent years the phenomena formerly associated with the so-called 'agricultural ladder' have changed. . . . First . . . movement up the ladder, through the various stages from that of farm laborer and tenant to that of owner, has been seriously retarded; second . . . the movement down the ladder, involving loss of status as owner, reduction in status as tenant, or loss of the farm entirely, has been accelerated, and third . . . the tendency for American farmers to stay at particular levels of the agricultural ladder has become more noticeable." (*Technology on the Farm*, p. 66.)

The ideological superstructure which corresponded to the "normal," "independent," "individual," farmer is being undermined. The belief in capitalism as a system is being undermined even though among those who are losing faith there is no general appreciation yet of the possibilities of a genuine security.

"Technological changes, commercialization, better communications in rural areas have had their influence upon the family, the neighborhood, and the community. Probably the most important influence has been that of widening the contacts of the individual and partially freeing him from the inscrutable and relentless control of his local com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity. On the one hand, he has been brought into closer contact with and made dependent on the town and city where he learns to question the older values and beliefs; and on the other hand, he has been freed from the rigorous control of the rural community. Life, therefore, has become more complex. He is given new desires by association with people who have many material things which he does not have, and he is not certain what reward or loss will be forthcoming if he pursues a given line of action. His desires grow out of all proportion to the means of satisfying them. Finding himself frustrated by desires which cannot be satisfied under old standards, the sanctity of which is questioned, it is natural for him to disregard old beliefs." (*Ibid.*, p. 70.)

The Program of the Bourgeoisie

A major aim of the bourgeoisie is to cut production through curtailment of one kind or another in order to forestall destruction of "surplus" production. A second aim is to maintain the base of operations of the rich and upper middle farmers, to sustain their growth as capitalists, and to plow under the poor and small farmers at near-subsistence levels at the other pole.

The attitude of the bourgeois farm experts to the various classes in the countryside may be summarized as follows: (1) Rich farmers: Changes should not be "carried out to the point of alienating the support of the larger producer because to do so would tend to defeat the purpose of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program." (2) Middle Farmers: Provide them with a "stake in the land" which "might still be strong enough to give all the advantages [or at least illusions] of ownership." (*Ibid.*, pp. 89, 90.) (3) Poor Farmers: Subsistence, non-commercial activity, self sufficiency, all at a primitive level of technique. (4) Farm Workers: Subsistence.

The bourgeois agricultural experts, in general, attempt to meet the glaring contradiction in agricultural development by the contention that a stable development of agriculture under capitalism in the United States can be assured by (1) "small," "family-sized," technically well-equipped, commercial farms, and (2) smaller, technically retarded, self-sufficing, non-commercial farms or plots.

The guarantees for the family-sized farm, they declare, include "family-sized" mechanization and equipment, in contrast to more-than-family-sized technological advances. This proposal to counter the tendency toward larger farm units and to guarantee the "family-sized" farm is simply fraudulent.

Increased mechanization in these terms means increased capital investment. It means clearly enlarging the economic size of the farm unit even though the acreage—the false criterion of the bourgeois farm experts—remains the same.

Increased capital investment inevitably means greater infiltration of finance capital, greater domination of big capital over agriculture. Increased mechanization means greater displacement of wage labor on the "family-sized" farm. Increased capital investment means

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowered unit production costs and inevitably aggravates the position of those poorest sections of the farm population who are unable to increase their capital investment.

Such "family-sized" mechanization and greater "family-sized" capital investment will mean, where it succeeds, the raising of a few middle farmers into the upper-middle brackets, while the great majority will find that the struggle for existence takes place on a higher level of technique, at a more intensified tempo.

As far as the poorest sections of the farm population are concerned the bourgeois agricultural experts propose to guarantee stability through subsistence existence. This is to be achieved by the "development of rural industries," "non-commercial" farms, training for farm and non-farm jobs, self-help cooperatives, cooperative farming, part-time jobs, etc., etc. (See *Technology on the Farm.*)

Common to all such proposals are the conviction that (1) a whole section of our rural population is superfluous as far as agriculture is concerned, (2) industry offers no alternative productive activity for those rendered superfluous in the development of agriculture, and (3) ways and means should be found to subsist in the rural areas of the country. These ways and means must be such as to exclude this section of the rural population from commercial activity.

Conclusion

Capitalism in agriculture is incompatible with the interests of the toiling people either on the land or in the cities.

The further development of technique in agriculture under capitalism will aggravate all the contradictions inherent in the capitalistic development of agriculture.

The further development of agriculture under capitalism will sharpen the contradictions within agriculture, between technical progress and its effect on the welfare of the people, between the people and finance capital.

The further development of agriculture under capitalism will doom millions of farm families to a further deterioration of living standards, to privation and migration.

Only a people's government, backed by the people, and leading them in decisive struggle against finance capital and monopoly, can turn the direction of development from social decay and retrogression on the farms, to social progress, to beneficent scientific advance, to security for the rural toilers, and to prosperity for the toiling people.

Only the uprooting of the exploiting and expropriating class, only the extinction of capitalism as a system, only the unleashing of the people's energies and of science, can set free the countryside, break down the cultural barriers to the cities, destroy the conflict between country and city, and unite industry and agriculture into one common social enterprise. Only socialism can release the nation from the chains of a decaying order.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TREASON OF REACTION IN AMERICA'S SECOND WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

BY FRANK MEYER AND ROBERT STRONG

THE history of the period after the victory of the democratic people's movement under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson in 1800, a period which culminated in the War of 1812, is the history of the completion of the struggle for independence from Britain and against Federalist reaction at home. It is a story rich in material for an understanding of the development of the struggle for democracy—and particularly rich in examples of the degeneracy of those representatives of reaction who are the heroes of the Oliver Wiswell school of history, spawned by decaying American imperialism.

The surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown signalized the victory of a broad alliance of the American people, of the unity of farmers and artisans, merchants and planters, in the Revolutionary War.

But, independence from Britain once won, a section of this alliance, the aristocratic merchants and bankers, "the rich, the well-born and the able," as they liked to call themselves, became alarmed at the continuation of the democratic mass movement of the small farmers and artisans; the revolution threatened to go beyond the limits within which its energies could be harnessed to their own selfish class interests. Headed by Alexander Hamilton and John Adams, this commercial aristocracy formed the Federalist Party with the aim of winning control of the national government in order to utilize it further to enrich themselves and increase their power at the expense of the people.

Within the now independent states a new struggle burst forth, whose object was to guarantee and extend the democratic victories won in the revolutionary war with Britain. It was a struggle for extended suffrage, civil liberties, destruction of the remnants of special privilege hanging over from the past, and, above all, free access to the land, the basic means of production of the time.

As Earl Browder has pointed out, summarizing Jefferson's position:

"Governmental power, political power, can be built only upon a foundation of economic power, that is, ownership, control, and operation of the basic economy of the country, which is the foundation of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social life; the America of the late 18th and early 19th centuries was able to achieve such a foundation by breaking up the great colonial land monopolies and opening up the great territories to the West, and by the widespread distribution of free or cheap lands." (*The Democratic Front*, Workers Library Publishers, pp. 89-90.)

Before the Revolution, the ruling classes of Britain had sought, in their own interests, to prevent this westward expansion, the free access of the people to the land. Now the American mercantile aristocracy in turn came into opposition to the farmers and artisans by restricting free democratic access to the West. This it did by developing monopoly speculation in these lands; building up the national debt, profitable to their own speculations; and placing a heavy tax burden on the farmers.

A New Stage of Struggle

The popular class alliance which had defeated Britain to win independence and create the United States now was confronted with treachery fom the reactionary Fedealist camp. Representing a numerically small, but powerful group of mercantile capitalists, bankers and speculators, the Federalists, to advance their own immediate, narrow, class interests, were ready and eager to betray the national independence and the democratic masses of the U. S. to the British Tories. Traitors to the American Revolution, they collaborated with Great Britain, which was at that time leading the forces of reaction to butcher the French Revolution and prevent the spread of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Europe. Today their counterparts of Wall Street and Washington laud Hamilton, condemn Jefferson, and collaborate with imperialism abroad to try and bring about the downfall of the Soviet Union and to crush the developing Socialist and national-liberation revolutions in both hemispheres.

Henceforth, the real national interests of the country, the continuation of the struggle for national independence against Britain, could only be advanced in sharp conflict of the democratic masses against the Federalist camp.

It was Great Britain which still stood in the way of the advance to the West by its maintenance, contrary to the peace treaty, of military posts in the Northwest Territory. It was Britain which encouraged the Indian attacks upon the border and refused, in sphere after sphere, to recognize the full independence of the United States. The struggle against Federalist mercantile reaction was part and parcel of this struggle for national independence.

It was the urgent need for land, the control of which they saw as their only guarantee of freedom, which had impelled the great mass of the population, the small farmers, to revolutionary action in 1776, as it was the compelling necessity to expand trade and the nascent manufacture which had moved the mechants. In 1776 the interests of both these groups, the commercial bourgeoisie and the petty commodity producers, the petty bourgeoisie, demanded a struggle for national independence, a struggle to which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their potential mutual antagonism was largely subordinated.

But with the throwing off of the British yoke, this antagonism came to the fore. The development of the United States of America as a nation —the eventual full flowering of its industrial forces of production— demanded expansion Westward. For the country to advance, a broad economy of independent farmers was necessary—the only basis on which the natural resources could be exploited, the home market widened and developed, opening the gates for the growth of manufacture and industry.

In this struggle the democratic farmers and artisans found allies among the Southern planters, particularly among the small and middle planters. The possibility of this alliance arose from certain mutual interests and the common antagonisms to the mercantile aristocracy of the North. The financial policy of the Federalist Party, with its national bank, national debt, and its taxes directed primarily against the agrarian communities, affected the slave-owner as well as the small farmer. Goaded by the exhaustion of the soil after many decades of tobacco cultivation, the land-hungry planters looked to the West, finding common interest with the farmers in opposition to the restrictive land policies of Federalism. Allied with a progressive class, they were often dragged further along in a progressive direction than the narrow consciousness of their own interests would have taken them. At the same time, however, their essentially reactionary class nature made that alliance unstable in character and caused contradictions within it which, particularly in the conduct of the War of 1812, were to have very serious effects.

It was from this class, and particularly from among the small plantation owners of the hinterland, that the agrarian democracy received many of its leaders. That so many of the leaders of the democratic movement were themselves slave-owners has made it easier for the great majority of American historians to ignore the fundamental class character of the great mass movement of that period. This is true both of the older writers of the traditional schools and of the "economic determinists" and "muckrakers" of more recent times.

These historians have ignored the fact that the driving force of the whole democratic struggle under the leadership of Jefferson was the small commodity producer, the farmer and the artisan. The movement was a democratic people's movement against reacton at home and abroad.

The Federalist Reaction

The Federalist Party, riding high during the second administration of Washington and the administration of John Adams, made a desperate effort to destroy this growing movement. In domestic policy this was reflected in the Alien and Sedition Acts—the "legal" persecution of the followers of Jefferson as "foreign agents" and "subversive French revolutionaries"—and the military suppression of the people's movements, as in the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794 and Fries Rebellion of 1799. Coupled with this was a foreign policy of subservience

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the leader of world reaction, England, and bitter hostility to revolutionary France (for example, the notorious "XYZ affair," an attempt by the Federalist administration to provoke war against France in 1798).

The Victory of the People

But, united under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, the democratic masses, after ten years of struggle, defeated the new enemy at home. Wresting control of the government from the hands of the Federalists, they elected Jefferson to the Presidency as candidate of the Democratic-Republican Party in 1800.

This victory broke the stranglehold of the reactionary forces upon all branches of the government, except the judiciary, where Marshall and other Federalist judges, secure in posts with life tenure, defied the will of the people. It brought about the revocation of the Alien and Sedition Acts, the pardoning of the victims of these laws, and the restoration of civil rights to the people. A popular wind swept through the land, bringing a greater measure of democracy into the state and local governments, clearing out to a considerable extent the debris of customs and institutions inherited from the old world, and curtailing the privileges of the so-called "aristocracy of wealth and talents," the bulwark of the Federalist Party.

Economically, likewise, the measures of the Democratic-Republican administration opened wide the possibilities of ownership of the land by the people—the purchase of Louisiana, which opened the enormous territory between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains to American settlement; the land laws of 1800 and 1804, which made much easier the acquisition of land by the small farmer; the Lewis and Clark expedition, which blazed the way for tens of thousands of future settlers from the Ohio to the Pacific. Its financial policies curbed the power of the bankers and merchants of Boston, New York and Philadelphia. It reduced the burden of taxation which had fallen primarily upon the small producers and the consumers—a burden so heavy that it had led to such actions as the Whiskey Rebellion.

On the basis of these democratic policies Jefferson was overwhelmingly re-elected to office in 1804. The Federalists were able to carry only two states—Delaware and Connecticut. Their power was broken. They had lost all popular support and, therewith, all possibility of regaining power through constitutional means. Every year, every month, the democratic forces were strengthened by the growing population of the Western territories and states, with their democratic frontier institutions based upon land ownership by tens of thousands of small farmers. The prosperity of the developing country under Jefferson's leadership undermined even the old strongholds of Federalism in New England.

The Federalists Turn to Treason

But "the rich, the well-born and the able" could not reconcile themselves to the rule of the people. No longer able to rule within an independent United States, they saw their only hope of regaining power

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in war and disruption, in the betrayal of the very independence for which they had once fought, in the disintegration of the Union. Opposition to the policies of the people's movement became their sole guide to action. For example, under Jefferson's first administration they at one time demanded war against France, which had purchased Louisiana from Spain; a few months later, when Jefferson had succeeded in peacefully obtaining this same territory by purchase from Napoleon, they—the party that had fought for a "strong national government"—howled that the government had no right to add to the territory of the original Union.

Such unprincipled activity only weakened their influence the more. Unable to gain any ground through open political activity, they turned to treasonous intrigue for secession and adherence to Britain. The public activities of the Federalist Party became the mask for conspiracy and were directed solely toward aiding that conspiracy through disrupting and demoralizing the government.

In 1804 they were implicated in Aaron Burr's plot to dismember the United States with the aid of Britain and Spain. Right down to the outbreak of the War of 1812, and throughout its course, they functioned as concealed enemies of the very existence of the American nation. And, like the Trotskyites and Bukharinites in the Soviet Union, unable to find a base for their aims among their own people, they looked abroad for aid; they became the real "foreign agents," "fifth columnists," agents of the tyranny and despotism of Britain.

Where else could they look? Like the Trotskyite-Bukharinite conspirators in the Soviet Union, the leadership of the Federalists even lacked confidence in their ability to win the support of what remained of their own camp if they fully revealed their real aims. On March 17, 1804, Stephen Higginson of Massachusetts writes to Timothy Pickering, the leader of the Federalists:

"I have seen your letters to Mr. Cabot and Mr. Lyman on the question of separation. . . . We all agree that there can be no doubt of its being desirable; but of the expediency of attempting it or discussing it now at this moment, we are all very much in doubt. . . . Many even of our own party have as much yet to unlearn as to learn. They have yet much of the Democratic taint about them; and with this nonsense in their brains . . . we should be put into the background, were we to make that question the subject of free conversation." (Henry Adams, [ed.] *Documents Relating to New England Federalism,* New York, 1878, p. 361.)

In the guarded language of conspiracy, Pickering himself writes to the British Minister, G. H. Rose, on March 13, 1808:

"I also know that . . . our own best citizens consider the interests of the United States to be interwoven with those of Great Britain, and that our safety depends on hers. Men thus enlightened, could they control the measures of their own government, would give them a direction mutually beneficial to the two nations. Of the opinions and reasonings of such men, I wished you to be possessed."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was but one instance in a long history of intrigue with Britain. As far back as 1804 we find Anthony Merry, an earlier British Minister, reporting to the British Foreign Office:

"I am led to believe from the language of some of the members [of Congress] of this State [Massachusetts] that their anxiety on this head is so great [the discussion of a boundary treaty with England] . . . that the rejection . . . would . . . prove to be a great exciting cause to them to go forward rapidly in the steps which they have already commenced toward a separation from the Southern part of the Union. . . . I learn from members of the Senate that their plans and calculations respecting the event have been long seriously resolved . . . they naturally look forward to Great Britain for support and assistance whenever the occasion shall arrive." (Henry Adams, *History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*, New York, 1930, Vol. II, p. 392.)

In two letters written as far apart as 1803 and 1814, Pickering sums up the treasonable calculations which lay at the base of the activity of the Federalists throughout the period:

"Although the end of all our revolutionary labors and expectations is disappointment [shades of Trotsky!] and our fond hopes of republican happiness are vanity, and the real patriots of '76 are overwhelmed by the modern pretenders to that character, I will not yet despair: I will rather anticipate a new Confederacy . . . there will be—and our children at farthest will see it—a separation." (Pickering to Richard Peters, Dec. 24, 1803. *New England Federalism* [cited], p. 338.)

Eleven years later, Pickering writes to Gouverneur Morris:

"For many years past I have said, 'Let the ship run aground! The shock will throw the present pilots overboard; and then competent navigators will get her once more afloat, and conduct her safely into port.'" (Adams, *History of the United States* [cited], Vol. III, p. 210.)

The political principles of this great American "patriot" are summed up in his famous toast—"The world's last hope—Britain's fast-anchored isle!"

The International Background

The situation in Europe was highly favorable to the prosecution of these plots against the independence of the United States. Since 1793 England had been almost continuously at war with France, organizing and leading a coalition of every reactionary force in Europe against the French Revolution. In this it had the double aim of checking the democratic movement of the people of France and the rest of the Continent and suppressing the development of France as a new capitalist rival. The French people's revolutionary army cleared out the native and foreign counter-revolutionaries from the territory of France and, assuming the counter-offensive, toppled over the throne of one feudal ruler after another.

In the desperate fight between France and all the forces of the old regime headed and inspired by the British ruling classes, Jefferson's policy was directed toward main-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taining peace for the United States while at the same time safeguarding America's independence. This meant, first and foremost, resistance to Britain. For political independence could be guaranteed, and the threat of British domination forever destroyed only by freeing the United States from economic dependence on Britain. The British ruling classes, aristocratic landowners and merchant-capitalists had never become reconciled to the independence of the American nation. As we have shown, they stood in the way of the settlement of the Northwest Territory between the Ohio and Mississippi. They had never recognized the sale of Louisiana by Spain to Napoleon and, therefore, the legality of Jefferson's purchase of that territory. Hence, they threatened, once the European war was over, to take it from the United States. The existence of British power in Canada, as a base for intrigues among the Indians and as a constant military threat to the entire West, menaced the security of the American farm population.

Alarmed by the threat to their control of world trade from America's growing commerce, Britain developed the policy which was expressed in the infamous "Orders in Council." These "Orders" were a series of measures which, in effect, declared that American ships trading with French and Spanish colonies or with the European ports under Napoleon's control were subject to seizure by the British navy, or, at the very least, to inspection, licensing and the payment of duties to Britain.

This policy, while ostensibly inspired by the needs of warfare against France, was unquestionably *primarily directed* at stifling American trade, and represented an attempt, at one and the same time, to *protect the commerce of Britain, reduce the United States to the economic status of a colony, and sow disruption in the United States* by convincing the merchants of New England and the middle states that their economic prosperity depended upon subservience to Britain.

Beard's Interpretation

That this policy was directed primarily against the United States is ignored even by historians who regard the War of 1812 as having been provoked by Great Britain. This is even more true of such historians as Beard, who blur the full progressive significance of the struggle led by the farmers for national independence, and the control of land and trade which guaranteed that independence, by narrowing down that conflict to an immediate selfish interest. They therefore minimize the many-sided attack of Britain on the young United States and accept the British policy at its face value as one whose main purpose was victory over Napoleon. Its effects upon the United States they regard merely more or less "unfortunate" by-products.

Beard ignores the fact that the very "Orders in Council," supposedly inspired by the needs of prosecuting the war against France, were in actual fact evaded in a wholesale fashion by British merchants themselves trading with the "blockaded"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Continental ports *under official British Board of Trade licenses*. He seems unaware that the very author of the policy of the "Orders in Council," James Stephen, clearly stated that the policy was primarily directed at American commerce.

Yet it is hard to see how he can be ignorant of this, or of the categorical conclusion of Henry Adams, the greatest authority on the history of the period, who states:

"According to the public and private avowals of all the Ministry, the true object of Perceval's orders [the Orders in Council] was . . . to protect British trade from competition. Perceval did not wish to famish France, but to feed her. His object was commercial, not political; his policy aimed at checking the commerce of America in order to stimulate the commerce of England. The pretense that this measure had retaliation for its object and the vindication of international law for its end was a legal fiction, made to meet the objections of America and to help Canning [the British Foreign Secretary] in maintaining a position which he knew to be weak." (Adams, *History of the United States* [cited], Vol. IV, p. 101.)

And again:

"His [James Stephen's] speech of March 6, 1809, once more asserted, in language as positive as possible, that the Orders had no other purpose than to stop the American trade with France because it threatened to supplant British trade. The doctrine of retaliation, or the object of retorting evils on France, had nothing to do with Stephen's scheme." (*Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 61.)

It is clear, too, that in addition to the aim of strangling American commerce and subordinating the U. S. to a colonial status, the British ruling class was playing another game, similar, in a sense, to that which it has been playing with small European neutrals in the present war. It was trying to force the United States into an unneutral position with regard to Napoleon. The United States was given the choice of resisting England's decrees or of committing hostile acts against France by accepting them.

The position of the United States was by no means made easier by Napoleon, who replied to the Orders in Council with a series of decrees which commanded seizure of American ships complying with the British Orders in Council. These decrees, and the measures taken by Napoleon to enforce them, have enabled such historians as Beard to place equal guilt upon England and France and to ignore the basically different relationship of these countries to American national and democratic intersts. Blinded by the fact that American commerce was being attacked *both* by Napoleon and Great Britain, Beard, always the "economic determinist," fails completely to see that the independence of the United States and, with it, the *most fundamental class and national interests of the mass of the people were directly threatened by England,* and not by France.

The Federalists Seize an Opportunity

In the dangerous situation into which the young American republic was thrust in this period, the Fed-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eralists saw their opportunity. At every turn and in every way they opposed, legally and illegally, the policies of the Administration. At the same time, they prepared the ground to take advantage of the immobilization and demoralization of American policy, which they themselves were attempting to bring about, for the purpose of destroying the Union and attaching at least a portion of it once again to Great Britain.

Jefferson Policy

Jefferson, expressing the will of the American people, steadfastly directed his policy against the aims of Britain and the Federalists. In implementing his policy, he faced two alternatives—war or economic counter-pressure.

Jefferson was not a pacifist as some historians have asserted. He recognized that, under certain conditions, resistance to tyranny and oppression requires struggle. He wholeheartedly supported the Revolutionary War of 1776. When, at the time of his election in 1800, the Federalist Party tried to deprive the people of the fruits of their victory by a counter-revolutionary putsch, he stated that, if such a plot were attempted, "the middle states will arm" and march on Washington to enforce the will of the majority of the people.

But he feared that war would lead to the enrichment of profiteers and speculators; the impoverishment of the people; the wiping out of a treasury surplus which could be used for public education, for the construction of roads to the west, etc. He felt that satisfaction of the demands of the United States could be wrung from England by economic counter-pressure.

That the series of measures passed by the Democratic-Republican Congresses from 1806 up to the eve of the outbreak of the war were not effective in stopping the attacks upon the United States seems largely due to the fact that they could not be effectively enforced, owing to persistent sabotage by the powerful Federalist banking and mercantile interests.

Beginning with the Non-Importation Act of 1806, which forbade importation of certain British products, but which was not enforced in the hope that its mere passage would cause Britain to give way, the Administration passed on to more stringent action—the Embargo Act of 1807, which forbade all American ships to leave port and barred all American exports to foreign countries.

These measures were directed primarily against England, which was dependent upon such American products as wheat, cotton, beef, pork and lumber, and which, because of her command of the sea, was in a position to prevent American products from reaching France in any case. The repeal of Napoleon's counter-measures to the British Orders in Council was also an object of this pressure. While the central policy of the administrations of Jefferson and Madison was directed against England, at each stage an attempt was made to take advantage of the antagonism between England and France. This was done either by openly stating

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or diplomatically hinting that American measures would be withdrawn with regard to that country which first withdrew its restrictive measures.

Sabotage by the Federalists

The embargo, had it been enforced, would have caused great commercial distress in the United States; but it would unquestionably have been a potent weapon against Britain. As it was, every nerve of the Federalists was strained to evade it. Federalist smugglers violated it on every hand. Federalist governors and state officials refused to recognize it. Federalist judges refused to enforce it.

Throwing all pretense of patriotism to the winds, Federalist pamphleteers even supported the British claim to "impress" American seamen, a claim which had recently been put into effect by a British attack upon a United States warship, the *Chesapeake*, and the slaughter of a number of American sailors in American waters.

Pickering openly stated:

"Although Great Britain and her thousands of ships of war could have destroyed our commerce, she has really done us no essential injury."

His Federalist colleague, John Quincy Adams, Senator from Massachusetts, repudiated this treasonable position of his party:

"Orders once submitted and carried to the extent of their principle would not have left an inch of American canvas upon the ocean but under British license and British taxation."

The embargo was, however, repealed in 1809. This was due to the combined pressure of the economic distress caused by the embargo, its lack of complete effectiveness due to Federalist sabotage and propaganda, together with the factional activities of representatives of sections of the Democratic-Republican Party itself.

The embargo was followed by other measures which attempted to bring pressure to bear upon one or another of the belligerents to revise their policy. The administration of Madison, who succeeded Jefferson in 1809, made a series of diplomatic attempts to back up these acts. But the sabotage, which had made the embargo so largely ineffective, was even more successful under these weaker measures.

The Second War of Independence

The only recourse left to the United States was war.

The growing sentiment for war sprang primarily from the new frontier states and the Western sections of the older states, whose population consisted predominantly of small farmers. They realized that the economic power of the merchants and bankers had prevented effective, peaceful resistance to Britain. They suffered economically from the British monopoly of the European market and the depredations on American commerce, which had brought on the depression of 1811-1812, seriously affecting the South and West. They suffered from the threat held over their heads of British-provoked Indian attack, inspired from Britain's base in Canada. They felt

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that "the final expulsion of England from the American continent" (as Jefferson put it in a letter to Duane, Aug. 4, 1812) was essential to the safety of the country. At the same time, the possession of the fertile and unsettled land of Canada, so like the Northwest Territory in its suitability to the farming methods to which they were accustomed, seemed equally necessary to economic development. (Likewise, their planter allies saw in Spanish-held Florida, with the constant threat of English occupation, a similar danger and a similar opportunity.)

The small farmers, whose class interests coincided with the true national interests of America, demanded a United States really free and independent. They saw in war against Britain the only remaining means of guaranteeing the independence won in 1776 and democratic control of the state and the land, upon ownership of which rested the possibility of political freedom.

"Agricultural Imperialism" or War of Independence?

The narrow bourgeois vision of historians like Beard fails completely to comprehend these basic interests in their fullness. To them, the cause of the war is the "imperialist" desire of the Western farmers to seize Canada, and of the Southern planters to seize Spanish territory to the West and South. They disregard or underemphasize the significance of Britain's attack on American independence, all along the line, on land and sea. They regard the British depredations on American commerce, the impressment of American seamen, the driving of American commerce from off the seas, as basically irrelevant to the outbreak of the war. Centering their attention on the merchants, whose immediate interests seemed most directly affected by these depredations, these historians fail to see that the issue of American national existence was involved in these attacks.

Certainly the merchants, who formed the backbone of the Federalist Party, were actuated by the interests of their class. But those interests which were decisive in determining the policy of that class assumed the expression, first of all, of a desperate struggle to destroy the power of the people, even at the cost of temporary economic sacrifices. The Federalist merchants could carry on their trade with some discomfort under the British flag and the protection of the British navy. What they hated a thousand times more than subservience to the British ruling class was the curbing of their power in the United States by the growing strength of the popular movement.

Speaking on the proposal to admit another Western state, Louisiana, Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, stated in the House of Representatives on Jan. 14, 1811 that, if the strength of the people expressed through the Western states was allowed to grow, it would be the occasion for some of the states "to prepare definitely for a separation—amicably if they can, violently if they must." This is the very language of a later reactionary class, the slave-owners of 1860, when

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they in turn were faced with the rising power of the progressive classes of their time determined to make an end of the stranglehold of a minority of powerful aristocrats upon the life of the country.

The Federalist merchants were content, so long as the popular progressive forces were defeated, even if it meant victory for Britain. The Chinese of today have a phrase for it: "Running dogs of the imperialists."

American national interests on the high seas, like the national interests on the Western frontier, found their champion in the small farmers and artisans, whose progressive democratic position made them, at the same time, the vanguard of the nation in its struggle for existence.

Beard's utter failure to understand the real significance of the war is summed up in the title of the chapter in which the war is discussed, "Agricultural Imperialism"(!)—the "imperialism" of the struggling democracy of the New World directed against "poor little Britain"!

The elections of 1810 returned the so-called "Warhawk" Congress, in which the determination of the farmers to resist the native and foreign conspiracy against the independence of the United States was expressed by such men as John Calhoun of western South Carolina and Henry Clay of Kentucky. (In passing, it is interesting to note that these two men, who in 1810 were spokesmen for the frontier, later, as their regions developed economically, became the spokesmen respectively of the slave-owners and the capitalists against the farmers of the newer frontier, represented by Jacksonian democracy.)

The Federalists Undermine the War Preparations

With the country headed toward war, preparation was imperative. The army had less than 10,000 regulars in addition to the militia of the different states. The navy had no more than half a dozen first-line battleships. Yet, with the certainty of war becoming clearer day by day, measure after measure for adequate preparations was defeated in Congress by the combined vote of the Federalists and factional groups within the Democratic-Republican Party. The Federalists voted for a five-year term of army enlistment because they felt that it would bring about great difficulties in the raising of troops. John Randolph, leader of an anti-administration faction, sabotaged preparedness by lining up Southerners against a provision enabling the President to use the state militias outside the United States boundaries (that is, in Canada). He succeeded in this by taking advantage of the differing interests of the slave-owner and farmer wings of the Democratic-Republican Party.* Provisions for an adequate tax program and for a navy capable of defending the coasts of the United States were defeated. A combination of the machinations of the Federalists, and the unstable character of the alliance which sup-

* One of the considerations weighing heavily with Randolph (a large slave-holder) was fear of the slaves in case of war. This was a considerable factor in developing Federalist sentiment in the South.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ported Madison, sabotaged the preparations for war as the embargo had been sabotaged before.

The desperate conspiracy of the Federalists now reached astonishing depths of villainy. The British Minister at Washington, Augustus John Foster, writing to his government on Dec. 11, 1811, reported proposals made to him by responsible Federalist leaders, which showed that they were prepared to go to any lengths to achieve their objective:

"The Federal leaders make no scruples of telling me that they mean to give their votes for war, although they will remain silent in the debates; they add that it will be a short war of six or nine months . . . telling me that they see no end to restrictions and non-importation laws but in war; that war will turn out the Administration, and then they will have their own way, and make a solid peace with Great Britain." (Adams, *History of the United States* [cited], Vol. VI, p. 172.)

On a later occasion Foster writes that on Feb. 1, 1812, two Federalist leaders called upon him to urge the British Government not to make any concessions whatever to the United States, in order that war might be provoked and the Administration thereby defeated.

"The sum of these suggestions," wrote Foster, "was that we should neither revoke our Orders in Council nor modify them in any manner. They said this Government would, if we conceded, look upon our concessions as being the effect of their own measures, and plume themselves thereon; . . . whereas, if we pushed them to the edge of the precipice by an unbending attitude, that then they must be lost, either by the disgrace of having nearly ruined the trade of the United States and yet failed to reduce Great Britain by their system of commercial restrictions, or else by their incapacity to conduct the government during the war. These gentlemen declared they were for war rather than for the continuance of the restrictory system, even if the war should last four years. . . . In short, they seemed to think that Great Britain could by management bring the United States into any connection with her that she pleased." (*Ibid.*, p. 174.)

As the election of 1812 approached, the Madison Administration, backed by the farmers and a section of the planters, carried through the declaration of war, which passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 79 to 49. The opposition centered in the representatives of the commercial interests and in the anti-Administration faction led by John Randolph. The war was opposed, not only by the merchants, but also by a section of the planters who formed part of the alliance that had carried Jefferson to power in 1800. Support for the war came mainly from the democratic masses of small farmers.

It is not within the scope of this article to discuss in detail the conduct of the war. Suffice it to say that, throughout the war, the greatest obstacle to its successful prosecution was sabotage and open opposition, particularly in Federalist New England. Federalists in Con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gress continued to obstruct war measures. Governors of New England states, with the exception of New Hampshire, refused point blank the request of the national government that their states supply their quota of militia. The Governor of Connecticut declared that "the State of Connecticut is a free, sovereign and independent state; that the United States are a confederacy of states," words to be echoed fifty years later by the representatives of Southern slavocracy. One member of the Massachusetts legislature declared that he would rather have the British constitution, "monarchy and all," than the American constitution with embargoes.

The financing of the war was deliberately obstructed in Northern financial centers. New England merchants and bankers refused to buy government bonds despite the fact that $10,000,000 out of the country's total cash, $17,000,000, was in New England. Henry Adams estimates that more New England money was invested in British than in American bonds. Extensive trade was carried on with the enemy; and Great Britain, recognizing the New England merchants as a valuable "fifth column" ally, exempted the coasts of New England from blockade during most of the war. So serious was this trading with the enemy that a British general reporting to England said that two-thirds of his armies in Canada were fed with beef from across the border.

In addition to the sabotage of the Federalist "fifth column," great difficulties in the prosecution of the war arose from the contradictions within the class alliance supporting Madison. Southern generals had little desire to win victories in Canada which might add non-slave territory to the Union. Besides, the army leadership was filled with incompetent "gentlemen," many from the ranks of the Southern slave-owners. Of these, the most notorious was Wilkinson, who had been deeply involved in the Burr conspiracy as well as in several other conspiracies against the government of the United States, but who had retained his commission by deserting his confederates each time he found the tide going against him.

In sharp contrast to the attitude of ex-President Jefferson, who never approached a question from the narrow class viewpoint of the Southern slave-owners, the prejudices and activities of political leaders and generals of the South made a victorious expedition into Canada impossible. James Monroe, Secretary of State and acting Secretary of War, urged the peace commission abroad to sign a treaty with England as soon as possible because he feared that his own armies would conquer Canada. He wrote: "Should our troops enter Canada, you will perceive the effect which success . . . might have on the public mind here, making it difficult to relinquish territory which had been conquered." Jefferson wrote, on the other hand, "the cession of Canada . . . must be a *sine qua non* of a treaty of peace."

The Hartford Convention—a Convention of Treason

But the basic responsibility for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the ineffectiveness of American arms in the war lay with the Federalists. The climax of their treachery was reached in 1914 when they succeeded in bringing about a meeting of representatives of five New England states at Hartford. It was the hope of Federalist leaders of the stamp of Pickering that this convention would take steps in the direction of secession.

Though this was the desire of the leaders of the Federalists, and though they were able to gain a good deal of mass support in New England in opposition to some of the government's policies, and even to the war itself, they completely lacked real mass support for their fundamental aims. The Hartford convention therefore had to restrict itself to making a series of more moderate demands. It resolved that the states represented should refuse the use of their militia to the national government and oppose conscription; and that each state should take care of its own defense. The convention demanded the passage of a number of amendments to the Constitution, providing, for example, that no new states should be admitted without the agreement of two-thirds of both houses of Congress; the prohibition of all embargoes exceeding sixty days; no interdiction of foreign intercourse or declaration of war without a similar vote; denial to naturalized citizens of the right to hold office in the United States (a continuation of the anti-alien policy of the Adams Administration).

In conclusion, the convention declared that, if the government did not comply with these demands, a new convention should meet and take "such powers and instructions as the exigencies of a crisis so momentous may require." It was the opinion of advanced Democratic-Republicans and of such patriotic Federalists as John Quincy Adams that the actions of the Hartford Convention, short though they fell of the real desires of the leaders, nevertheless constituted an act of treason.

The progress of the war had meanwhile reached a stalemate. While in its earlier days America's privateers and its few naval vessels had achieved great success against the supposedly invincible British fleet, as time passed the greater weight of the British navy made itself felt. On land, the treacherous and incompetent conduct of American generals, together with the activities of the Federalists, led to a series of disasters, culminating in the burning of Washington by British troops.

Nevertheless, it was clear that, even with the aid of their American allies, the British Government could not succeed in conquering the United States, particularly at a time when in England itself a popular movement was taking form against the mercantile-aristocratic combination which had ruled since 1688. After long negotiations a treaty of peace was signed in Ghent on December 24, 1814, a few days before Andrew Jackson crushingly defeated the British troops at New Orleans in the one great American land victory of the war. Here Pakenham's crack troops were de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feated by the frontiersmen, Negro and white, of the South and West. Louisiana was secured once and for all, together with the Port of New Orleans, vital alike to the interests of farmer and planter, the port without which the whole valley of the Ohio and Mississippi could not export their produce economically. Here the dissension between the South and the West, which led to such fiascos as the campaign against Canada, had no foundation, for both were in agreement that New Orleans had to be defended.

The end of the war, together with Jackson's victory, cut away whatever mass support the Hartford Convention might have had, and the committee of the convention sent to Washington to negotiate with the national government slipped out of the city and was never heard of again.

The treaty of peace, although avoiding explicit settlement of the questions over which the war was fought, nevertheless signalized a decisive victory for American independence and democracy, a conclusive proof that the United States were not only formally, but in actual fact, no colonies of Britain, but "free and independent states." Louisiana and the entire West were in practice secured for the United States. The American flag achieved full recognition on the high seas. The challenge to Britain's claims contained in the very declaration of war and the carrying on of armed resistance for two years, irrespective of future disputes on many questions, once and for all established the power of the United States to protect its independence.

At the same time, the successful outcome of the war dealt a death blow to Britain's most powerful force for the re-colonization of the United States, the Federalist Party; and through their sacrifices and struggles against enemies at home and abroad, the American farmers and their allies finally secured the victory of the American people over British oppression won in the Revolutionary War and over the aristocratic Federalist merchants, bankers and landowners won in 1800.

Within a few years' time, so complete was this victory, a Democratic-Republican, James Monroe, was elected President of the United States practically unanimously. The Federalists had passed forever from American history, defeated, discredited and despised.

New Alignments

The Embargo and the war, by cutting off European-manufactured goods, had given powerful impetus to the development of industry in the United States, bringing with it the development of new classes—the industrial capitalists and the working class. It is the beginning of a long period of profound class realignment. The policies of Jefferson and the Democratic-Republican Party—based as they were upon the interests of that class which was developing the most advanced forces of production of the time, for the reasons indicated at the outset of this article—of necessity laid the basis for the further development of those forces, for the development of industry.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In fact, as early as the War of 1812, some of the industrial capitalists broke with their mercantile cousins to support the war, though the time was yet far off when their class would lead the coalition of the people against the slavocracy of the South in the second great revolutionary period in American history.

The development of new and more powerful forces of production foreshadowed the end of the leading role of the petty commodity producer. However, allied with the nascent working class, they were to carry forward one more struggle for American democracy when, in the days of Jackson, they fought victoriously against merchant and industrial capitalists on the one hand and their former slave-owner allies on the other. But, with the further development of industry, they necessarily lost their vanguard role.

The great tradition of Jefferson, invoked again at the Chicago Convention of the Republican Party in 1860 in the struggle against the slavocracy, has today passed to the working class as the leading force in the struggle against monopoly capitalism.

The Federalists have had many successors in our history—the slaveowners of 1860, the imperialists of today. The slave-owners went down to defeat before the most advanced class of their time just as the Federalists did and the monopoly capitalists will. And, like the Federalists and slaveowners, the monopoly capitalists will stop at nothing in their desperate effort to prevent that inevitable defeat.

That is why the imperialists today rake up and glorify the worst in the past of our country, and that is why a true understanding of that past becomes a potent weapon in the hands of the people.

* * *

In 1812, the progressive development of the United States demanded the succesful prosecution of the war against England. The progressive classes of that day, the small farmers and artisans, carried that struggle to a successful conclusion and smashed the party of reaction which stood in their way.

Then, reaction fought against the prosecution of the war because it was a progressive war, a just war, a war of national independence. Today, the forces of reaction are dragging our country more and more deeply into a very different kind of war, a war of imperialist conquest, an unjust, robber war. Today, the American people, with the working class, the leading progressive class of our time, at their head, fights again as in 1812 for progress and freedom. But now that fight demands a struggle a*gainst* this reactionary war. And as Tromas Jefferson's party stood in the vanguard then, so the Communist Party, heir to its traditions, leads the way today, certain that now, as then, in the words of Browder, "the people are going to march forward —and to the people will belong the victory."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SPACE AND TIME—FORMS OF THE EXISTENCE OF MATTER

BY GEORGE KURSANOV

*IV. Space and Time as Discontinuous or Continuous**

MATTER is unique and continuous, there are no "breaks" or "gaps" in it, it is a single, indissoluble whole; and at the same time matter is discontinuous, it possesses atomic structure, matter is infinitely divisible. These properties of matter are what determine, respectively, the property of dicontinuity and continuity of space and time.

The discontinuity and continuity of space and time are directly demonstrated in motion and, specifically, in the single mechanical translation of bodies. Motion, as Lenin states, is the essence of space and time. The latter manifest themselves in motion in close unity. Explaining this essence, Lenin states.

"Two basic conceptions express this essence: (infinite) continuity and the 'punctuality' (=the negation of continuity—discontinuity). Motion is the unity of continuity (of time and space) and discontinuity (of time and space). Motion is a contradiction, a unity of contradictions."**

In this definition of Lenin's, space and time appear simultaneously discontinuous and continuous. The discontinuity of time and space means their infinite divisibility, infinite "punctuality." Space and time can be measured by infinitesimal portions. This property of theirs follows correspondingly from the property of the infinite divisibility of matter and from the discontinuity of motion, which, of course, exists only in unity with continuity.

The discontinuity of motion characterizes but one side of it—the infinite number of separate moments into which it can be mentally differentiated. This discontinuity of motion is what the discontinuity of space and time reflects.

These infinite moments of motion are simultaneously spatial and temporal in their close connection. In motion, space and time appear with their properties of discontinuity, infinite divisibility, "punctuality."

Space and time are in the same degree continuous. Their continuity follows from the uniqueness and continuity of matter, from the continuity of motion.

The material world is a unique indissoluble whole. In the universal space there are no voids, no blanks; the world is a world of continuous

* This is the concluding section of this essay, the first three parts of which appeared in the April, May and June issues of THE COMMUNIST. —*Ed.*

** V. I. Lenin, *Philosophic Notebooks* (Russ. ed.), p. 267.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter in motion. The continuity of matter, and of space and time, is closely connected with their infinity. The latter exists in connection with the continuity of matter—whence the continuity of space and time.

Continuity, in its turn, can be thought of only in connection with the infinity of matter and the infinity of space and time. Space appears as continuum. This is manifest in the continuous character of motion—the infinite moments of motion are in close mutual unity; they cannot be divorced one from the other; motion is a continuous process of discontinuous moments. Time is also a continuous process of the existence of matter. Time has no breaks or blank intervals, there is no existence out of time. Time flows totally and continuously; matter too is continuous and has time as the form of its existence. In relation to motion, time is just as continuous as space is. Motion is a process of continuous change of discontinuous moments, spatial and temporal. The continuity of time is closely bound up with the continuity of space.

We have examined briefly the fundamental general properties of space and time. By these we have in no way covered all the multiformity of their properties. We shall now consider certain of the specific properties of space and time.

Specific Properties of Space

The most important and general properties of space are its topological properties. Of these we shall discuss dimensionality and connectedness. One of the most important of the topological properties of space —infinity (openness)—was examined in connection with the eternity of time.

The dimensionality (the number of dimensions) of space is its most general characteristic. In respect to real spatial objects, this property determines whether these are linear (of one dimension) or plane (of two dimensions) or solid (of three dimentions). The dimensionality of space is what expresses its character from this point of view, *i.e.*, whether it is the image of surface or of volume.

We omit here the mathematical definition of dimensionality of space as having only technical interest. What we are here concerned with is the characteristics of the dimensionality of real space.

Engels states that real space is nothing else but an infinite number of cubic meters, *i.e.*, three-dimensional. Dialectical materialism affirms that space is three-dimensional, *i.e.*, that real space has three dimensions.

Space cannot be represented in the form only of a surface or a line; space possesses primarily the character of a volume. A surface has two dimensions (in terms of elementary geometry—length and width) and it does not exhaust space; a solid body possesses three dimensions (length, width, and height) and it fills completely a given portion of space. Infinite space can be mentally filled by an infinite number of solid, three-dimensional bodies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The three-dimensional character of real space is also confirmed by the laws of motion of material bodies. Here the laws of the mechanical form of material motion are decisive, *i.e.*, the laws of the spatial translation of bodies; for it is absurd to think a motion is possible in which mechanical translation occurs in a three-dimensional space, while, let us say, the electromagnetic transformations take place in a space of five dimensions.

We are considering the motion of material bodies in three-dimensional real space. The position of a moving body in space at any given moment of time in the process of motion is determined in space by three co-ordinates which are necessary and sufficient. And correspondingly, the motion of a material body in space is described by three equations, which, in the final analysis, reflect the actual character of space as three-dimensional.

Classical mechanics is based on equations derived from three-dimensional space. Its test in the social practice of man and in direct experiments (for instance, the laws of classical celestial mechanics) establish definitely the correctness in principle of classical mechanics. Its inadequacy in point of incompleteness and its approximate character, which was proved by the mechanics of the theory of relativity, in no way implies a denial of space as three-dimensional. It is just a matter of degrees of approximation to the knowledge of laws of motion of material bodies in space. In this respect classical mechanics is but a first step, while the relativity mechanics replaces it. The space of the theory of relativity is however still the same three-dimensional space.

Two things should be sharply distinguished here: three-dimensional space and the conditional "four-dimensional" space-time universe where time enters as a "fourth dimension," and space remains three-dimensional in all cases.

With reference to the dimensionality of space we must point out another factor: In modern mathematics the theory of n-dimensional space (a space of more than three dimensions) has gained considerable vogue. As a result, totally unfounded conclusions are sometimes drawn as to the existence in real space of four or more dimensions, a sufficient number of idealistic speculations are current with regard to the fourth dimension, speculations which lead directly to spiritism, as was noted by Engels in the article "Natural Science and the Spirit World." *

In mathematics n-dimensional space means not real space but any manifold of objects and their qualities; for instance, bodies, planes, lines, colors, sounds, and these are measured by properties common to them all. There may be, of course, four, five and more of such properties. It follows that the idealistic and spiritistic speculations are excluded, since the matter under discussion is not the dimensionality of the real space but the properties of various manifolds of fictitious mathematical spaces which in mathematics have

* Frederick Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*. International Publishers, pp. 297-310.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the value only of a definite mathematical instrument.

The next essential (topological) property of space is its connectedness. In relation to real space, this property of connectedness, being a geometrical property, expresses the physical continuity of space, and accordingly is defined by it.

The property of connectedness means the infinite proximity of all the points of space. Geometrically, this property is established on the basis of the conception of the neighborhood of a given point. By the neighborhood of any point "a" is meant the totality of all points lying at a distance from "a" less than any given positive number "e."

The connectedness of space is therefore a geometrical (more specifically—topological) property which expresses its physical continuity as a form of the existence of the unique and continuous matter. Connectedness as a geometrical property has for its physical content material space, and therefore it is logically bound up with the concept (in physics) of material fields, with the consequent negation of action at a distance, and with the conceptions of ether.

Next, after the topological properties of space, in the degree of their generality and importance, follow the projective, and then the metric, properties of space.

The projective properties of space are such properties of position of spatial figures, as remain unchanged under all transformations in which the magnitudes of angles, of lines and of elements may change, while linear properties are preserved. For instance, if some plane figure be projected on a plane by means of projection apparatus, this figure would undergo a projective transformation in which the dimensions of its parts, the proportions, the magnitudes of the angles change, while the linear properties remain. Straight lines remain straight lines. This property of preserving straight lines in projection is the projective property of the plane space.

The metric properties of space express quantitative relations of real spatial objects. The most important here are the characteristics and the corresponding mathematical expressions for the element of length.

For the plane space of Euclidean geometry, the element of length is expressed by the well-known theorem of Pythagoras. For spaces of constant curvature the element of length is defined by the so-called fundamental quadratic form, which takes into account the difference in the nature of space in different parts of it. A more precise expression of the element of length is achieved in the metric relations of Weyl's geometry, where the variable curvature of different parts of space is accounted for.

All this speaks clearly for the richness and inexhaustibility of the quantitative relations of space which are defined by the properties of matter itself. This fact was established by the theory of relativity which proved the limitations of the metric relations of the Euclidean geometry. The metric relations of real space are more complex, richer and finer than their expressions in any system of geometry.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Specific Properties of Time

We confine ourselves here to two properties of time which are the most fundamental: time is one-dimensional and irreversible (or directed). It must be observed that science has done exceedingly little to explain the nature of time.

Time is one-dimensional means that it is fully described by a single coordinate, which is analogous with the dimensionality of space. We can picture this as follows.

The position of a moving body in the space-time continuum is defined by three spatial co-ordinates and one temporal co-ordinate. Two or more temporal co-ordinates at a given moment of this motion cannot be given and one temporal co-ordinate completely determines the motion of a body, while one or two spatial co-ordinates do not correspondingly determine the motion of a body, but three are necessary. Time being one-dimentional, therefore, a single measurement along the single temporal co-ordinate fully defines the motion of a material body in time.

The irreversibility of the time process is the property of the flow of time in a single and unique direction. The life of matter is irreversible. History cannot turn back and start all over again. We distinguish past, present and future time, which proceed in a single and definite direction and are not interchangeable. Life is the eternal development of matter in one direction, and the irreversibility of time, as a form of the existence of matters, expresses this property of the life of matter. Irreversibility is accordingly an inalienable property of time and characterizes the irreversibility of the life process in general.

In the strict physical sense, the irreversibility of time is connected with the phenomenon of increasing entropy which characterizes all irreversible processes, *i.e.*, energy cannot flow from bodies with a lower level of energy to bodies with a higher level without receiving energy from without the system. In reality, the flow of heat from warmer bodies to cooler ones is a process which proceeds always in a single definife direction; this constitutes the physical basis for the irreversibility of time.

The attempts to apply mechanically the law of entropy to the whole of the universe and the reactionary deductions therefrom as to the "thermal death" of the universe which, it is claimed, must be the consequence of "thermal equilibrium," do not bear analysis. The German physicist Ludwig Boltzmann, and then Engels, showed convincingly that an eternal cycle of matter and life proceeds in the universe; what is destroyed in one place, inevitably reappears in another. The laws of the finite cannot be applied to the infinite universe.

We have considered only the most important properties of space and time, both the general and the special. The properties of space and time are just as manifold and inexhaustible as is matter. The continual discovery of new properties of space and time is the task of science, and is possible only on the granite basis of dialectical materialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED